

1.

Speaker Lechowicz: "The House will now come to order. All Members please by in your seats to be led in prayer by the Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe said: It is not doing the thing we like, but liking the thing we do that makes life happy. Let us pray. Almighty Lord, our Eternal Creator and Everlasting Father; Thou who alone orderest all mankind in every service to Thee and all that is Thine; we give Thee this day our gratitude for all the many joys and blessings of this life. Direct and guide us, O Lord, as we pursue our labours as Members of this House of Representatives that we may find true joy and happiness in knowledge that our doings are of pleasure to Thee and for the good of the people of the State of Illinois whom we do serve; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pledge of Allegiance."

Members: "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 Lechowicz: "The House will come to order. The Members will be in their seats. The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn, what purpose do you seek recognition? We already said the prayer."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table House Bill 2402."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave of the House to table House Bill 2402. You the principal Sponsor? Hearing no objections, the Bill is tabled. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Steczko: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to table House Bill 1371 and House Bill 1857."

Speaker Lechowicz: "1857, was that..."



Steczo: "1857 and 1371."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave of the House to table House Bill 1371 and 1857. Are there any objections? Hearing none, those two Bills are tabled. Anybody else care to table a Bill? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave to table House Bill 2314. I am the principal Sponsor. It is on Third Reading."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to table House Bill 2314. Any objections? Hearing none, House Bill 2314 is tabled. Anyone else want to table a Bill? Does anyone want to have a Bill called back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Would you kindly come up to the Parliamentarian and give me the numbers of the Bills, and we'll proceed to do that? The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to call House Bill 830 back to Second for the purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's on Third Reading now, John?"

Dunn: "On Third Reading, yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave...wait a minute, Jack, get up there. 830. Looking on page six of the Calendar, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 830, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Probate Act of 1975, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "In here. Does the Gentleman have leave to bring 830 back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment? Any objections? Hearing none, the Bill is on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, John Dunn, amends House Bill 830 as amended..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, Amendment #5."

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



This Bill...this Amendment will become the Bill, and this is an Amendment to attempt to correct a problem which is rising with the new guardianship law. We have a situation now that every time a guardian is appointed, the physician who makes a report must personally come to court and testify. This Amendment simply provides that where there is no contest, and no need for the doctor to do so, to come to court, the report...the physician's report will suffice. I request a..."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, I move to waive the appropriate rule to allow the Municipal Problems Commission to extend its time to report on House Joint Resolution 34 until June 30 of this year."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Bluthardt, I believe you need a Resolution in order to do that."

Bluthardt: "A Resolution?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yeah."

Bluthardt: "I moved to waive the appropriate rule, and that would...I assume, waive the necessity for a Resolution. With 89 votes you can do anything, Ted, can't you?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "According to the Parliamentarian, he would strongly recommend a written Resolution."

Bluthardt: "Alright, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "And a Joint Resolution. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman. Mr. Greiman, please."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take House Bill 842, which is on Third Reading on the Spring Calendar back to Second Reading."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine. It's on page six, Ladies and Gentle-



men, House Bill 842. The Gentleman has leave to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objections? Hearing none, the Bill is on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Pechous, amends House Bill 842 on page one, line one and five and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Pechous on the floor? You've got an Amendment on this Bill, Sir. Amendment #4,...page 42... excuse me. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Vinson: "Has...has the Amendment been printed and distributed?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, it has. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Pechous."

Pechous: "I would ask leave to withdraw Amendment #4 if this is alleged to be mine."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #4. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Vinson, amends House Bill 842 by deleting line one and two and so forth."

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

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment, in essence, would put the Bill in what I regard as the proper form. What it would do is enact a series of procedural reforms on the Commerce Commission that would guarantee open access to the public. It would not deal with the substance of rate making by and large, but it would guarantee open access to the public and a legitimate chance at regulatory participation and reform. It puts the General Assembly in the position of dealing with what it knows best, how to guarantee open access, open procedure, or free process. It does not put us into the posture of dealing with what we know nothing about, and that is the substance of rate making whether rates should be higher or lower, and what should be included in them, but it does guarantee open



access by the public and enacts a series of measures which insure that we have responsive rules and regulatory practices, and I would urge adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, those are, of course, the goals of Representative Marovitz and I, who as Sponsors of 842. However, we do not want this Bill to be used as...for a purpose that would be beyond what we believe...are the 'scope or the answer of this Bill'. The legislation which Representative Vinson has suggested is perfectly okay to be taken up in another Bill at another time, but not on this Bill. We have man...a number of items which we will be taking off of this Bill so that it will deal with single subjects so the General Assembly may decide on the issue of winter shut-offs and we have many many issues on this Bill, and we...it is our intention to remove those issues so that we have a single issue in this Bill, and I suspect that Representative Vinson's Amendment will cloud those issues and certainly frustrate the right of this Body to make a determination on one single issue, the issue of winter shut-off. So I would ask that it be...that it not be adopted on this Bill. I would be glad to work with Representative Vinson to develop other legislation at another time in another General Assembly in another world. Not now."

Vinson: "Well, Mr. Chairman, I am appalled at Mr. Greiman's position..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "One moment please...one moment please."

Vinson: "Oh."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, to close."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am appalled at Mr. Greiman's position on this. What we're trying to do...deal with here is legitimate regulatory reform. We're trying to give the people a chance to participate in their government



and in the making of utility rates which have become onerous, and I am appalled that Mr. Greiman would think that that clouds anything. I think that it casts light upon things. This is a sunshine Bill in a sense, and I would urge adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Greiman: "My name seemd to be mentioned in debate, and I wondered if the Gentleman had a little thing in his eye because he kept winking when he said that he really couldn't...you know, that was a cute smile, but he wasn't appalled at all."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You've got good eyes, Alan. All in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'nos' have it. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Marovitz, amends the engrossed House Bill 842 on page one by deleting line one and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Vinson: "I want a Roll Call on that Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Which one, six? You'll have it."

Vinson: "Five."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, five. Let's have the Roll Call for Attendance first. This will be the Attendance Roll Call. Attendance Roll Call, please. The... This is the Attendance Roll Call... Yeah, Sparky's here. The Clerk will take the Attendance Roll Call. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevech, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Matijevech: "Mr. Speaker, as long as we now have that Attendance Roll Call, and before I forget, could I ask leave and use of the Attendance Roll Call to suspend the posting notice so that House Bill 3249 can be heard next Tuesday in the Appropriations I Committee..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "John, we're going to do that for all the Committees very shortly. Let's get back to the Bill that was before us."

Matijeovich: "Alright."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Then I'll get back with you." Now let's... we're back on Amendment, I believe it was five, wasn't it, Jack? Mr. Vinson on Amendment #5, and the Amendment was moved in favor by Mr. Vinson, opposed by Mr. Greiman. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman, to explain his vote. Walt came back for the Roll Call, so what is the difference? Mr. Greiman please."

Greiman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to point out that I am a Sponsor. My Bill, the way I would like to have it, with the next Amendment that will take this out anyhow and will essentially put the Bill in a single subject so the General Assembly can decide on one issue. I think it is a fair thing. The Bill now has lots of issues. I'd like to get rid of a lot of issues. Just one issue on this. That's all. Thank you."

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

Vinson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would urge Members of the House to join in putting this Amendment on. This is a good pro-consumer Amendment that will give people access to the most important process the government does right now, and that is regulate their utility rates. It will assure fair reason participation by people. It is a good Amendment. It was drafted out at great lengths about a year ago, and I think that you'll find that most people who favor regulatory reform will be in favor of this Amendment, and it will have the General Assembly acting on procedure which we should be acting on."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish?"

Vinson: "I would like a verification of the negative Roll Call, Mr. Speaker if we don't get enough votes."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman is entitled to that. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 66 'ayes', 76 'nos', Mr. Greiman asks for a poll of the absentees. Thank you. That's a good way to start off our day. It will be a long night."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Alexander, Beatty, Bianco, Bullock, Conti, Davis, John Dunn, Ewell, Dwight Friedrich..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich. He wants to be recorded as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Gaines, Hanahan, Henry, Huff, Johnson, Emil Jones, Karpiel, Klosak..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Klosak wants to be recorded as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Macdonald, Marovitz, Mulcahey, Neff, Patrick, Pouncey, Reed, Ryan, Schlickman, Sharp, Swanstrom, Taylor, Wikoff, Woodyard, and Younge."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Neff wants to be recorded as 'aye'.

Mr., Mulcahey as 'aye'. Mr. Stanley as 'aye'. Mr. Margulas as 'aye'. Mr. Leverenz as 'aye'. Mr. Mautino as 'aye'. Flinn, 'aye'. Mrs. Younge as 'aye'. No... Mr. Slape as 'aye'. Mr. Harris as 'aye'. Mr. Davis as 'aye'. Mr. Birchler as 'aye'. Mr. Schraeder as 'aye'. Tell you what, because of the number of people that are seeking recognition,...are voting on the negative side, and I have not informed the Clerk of that. It would be a lot easier if we would just take another Roll Call. So on Amendment #5, all in favor...dump this Roll Call, Jack. All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Hit your button, please. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 83 'ayes', 47 'nos', and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Marovitz, amends engrossed House Bill 842..."

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





Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #6 provides that utilities shall be... first it removes the previous material that was put on last year. You may recall that this Bill was amended with a very...a very...long comprehensive list of utility reforms. Among them was one that dealt with the 'phantom' taxes, one that dealt with construction work and process, one that dealt with lobbying money, etcetera, that public utilities would be difficult to live with. We are removing those provisions from the Bill, and we are then instead adding a single Amendment that would deal with the right of a public utility to cut off during December...from December 1 to March 31. What this provides is that when a customer desires...or is not paying his Bill during those months, that the utility gives him an opportunity to go on a deferred payment agreement. If the person refuses to go into a deferred agreement...payment agreement, then and in that case the utility retains its rights to cut that person off. But if the person enters into a deferred agreement, then in that case, that cut off is deferred until after March 31 of the following year. This year, the Commerce Commission made a great effort in developing this kind of legislation. They adopted it by rules. It worked. The utility companies have some figures that they obviously have lost some revenues, but they have not lost anything. they have merely...have some receivables that they will indeed collect. It is a very sensible provision. It protects people from being shut off in the middle of winter. It is a sensible health provision, and I ask that Amendment #6 be adopted. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment? The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."



Kent: "Representative Greiman, could you tell me...if they have both gas and electric, are both of those covered?"

Greiman: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear the question. I'm sorry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "If they have gas and electric, are they both covered?"

Greiman: "It's public utilities. It's...it's...yes, it covers all of...all of them."

Kent: "But, are both Bills continued if they heat with gas and use electricity..."

Greiman: "They would have to go into a deferred payment. And if they didn't go into that kind of program, then they could be cut off clearly."

Kent: "In other words, if they do not go to a deferred payment, they can be cut off."

Greiman: "Oh yes, absolutely. That was much...last year, much of the criticism of the winter shut-off prohibition was that there was no payment arrangement, and I think that was a valid criticism. Presently, under this Bill, they would have to go into some kind of deferred payment program, and that would be a requirement so that nobody gets a free ride and can sneer at the public utility customers who ultimately have to foot all the bills. We are very concerned about that."

Kent: "Thank you."

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

Vinson: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Is Amendment #6 in order after adoption of Amendment #5?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jack, you want to send the Bill up? While we're...We have to wait for five to come back down. Do you have a copy of five over there? Would you bring it up? While we're in the process of awaiting a determination from the Parliamentarian I'll recognize Mr. Polk from Rock Island."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, the 81st General Assembly is extremely fortunate today to have in the Speaker's gallery up behind the Speaker's desk, Mr. Tom



Fletcher and the Thompson Junior High School group who are represented by Schoeberlein, Casey, and Murphy.

Would they please stand up and be recognized?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield. No, it's not.

The Amendment is not in order. Withdraw Amendment #6.

Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #7, Greiman-Marovitz, amends engrossed House Bill 842..."

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

Greiman: "Well, I'd like the Speaker to rule if that's in order."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, what?"

Greiman: "You might advise me as to whether that Amendment is in order. It probably...it might suffer the same state. I don't want to put us through hearing this Bill over and over again."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Why don't we take this Bill out of the record? You can take a look at Amendment #5 and check with the other Amendments. I believe that probably since Amendment #5 rewrote the entire Bill..."

Greiman: "Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...The subsequent Bills would be out of order at this time."

Greiman: "Take it out of the record then would you, Mr. Speaker? Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Bill's out of the record. Remains on Second Reading." The Gentleman from Williamson, Mr. Harris, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the point of introduction, I would like to introduce a former Member of the House, Representative Dick Hart from the 59th District, a fellow I always found easy to work with and our friend. Dick Hart."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the Calendar on page six also appears House Bill 821. The Lady from St. Clair requests leave to bring 821 back from Third to Second for the purpose of Amendment. Any objections? Hearing none,



821 is on Second Reading. Any Amendments? Ma'am, there are no Amendments filed with the Clerk. ...Back to Third Reading. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 942 by Mr. Vinson. He has leave to bring that Bill back from Third To Second for the purpose of Amendment. Senate Bill...it's Senate Bill, Jack. Correct the Board, please. Senate Bill 942. Any objection to bringing that Bill back for the purpose of Amendment? Hearing none, the Bill is on Second Reading. Mr. Vinson...would you... Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have filed a motion with the Clerk to table House Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "First of all, the Clerk would like to know where the Bill is at...oh, you have it now? Was that a Committee Amendment, Sir?"

Vinson: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "And you wish to table the Committee Amendment?"

Vinson: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? According to the Clerk, Amendment #1 has been tabled already. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. On the order of Second Reading appears House Bill 2227, Mr. Reilly."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2227, a Bill for an Act in relation ...in relation to a state-wide emergency medical services program, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Reilly, amends House Bill 2227 as amended by House Amendment #2..."

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

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 takes care of some problems that were raised in Committee with regard to the application of the Administrative Procedures Act..



doesn't substantively change the Bill at all. I would ask adoption of the Amendment."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Reilly, amends House Bill 2227..."

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

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 takes care of some questions that were raised in Committee as to the ability of the advisory council to somehow tie up the actions of the department and make it clear that they cannot. And I move the adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'...I'm sorry, four. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. Amendment #4 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Slape, amends House Bill 2227 as amended by House Amendment #2 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Slape." The Gentleman from Bond, Mr. Slape."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All this Amendment does is to place the appropriate naming of the Medical Society and ACEP to the Appellate Board. I ask adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion on this Amendment. Mr. Getty. Any further 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: "Floor Amendment #6, Reilly, amends House Bill 2227..."

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

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #6 which was introduced at the suggestion of the current occupant of the Chair makes clear that this Bill was not a limitation



on homerule power. I move the adoption of the Amendment."  
 Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from  
 Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Reilly: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Leverenz: "Would you make that presentation again? I just  
 didn't hear it at all. Does this have to do with District  
 #6?"

Reilly: "No, Representative Leverenz (sic) asks that we make  
 clear that this Bill was not a limitation on homerule  
 power, and this makes that clear."

Leverenz: "I see, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Leverenz, have your questions been  
 answered? Any further discussion? The question is 'Shall  
 Amendment #6 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying  
 'aye', opposed. Amendment #6 is adopted. Any further  
 Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Reilly, a request for the fiscal  
 note has been filed as well. So we'll have to keep this  
 Bill on Second Reading until that request is completed.  
 Ladies and Gentlemen, it gives me a great deal of pleasure  
 to introduce a former Member of this Body, now a trustee  
 at the Metropolitan Sanitary District, a Democratic  
 Committeeman of 'Liden' township, Jim 'Kerrig'. Jim,  
 it's good to have you here. Also, a former Representative,  
 Dick Hart, from Benton. It's good to have you here, Dick.  
 And also joining us today is the former Member of this  
 Body, now an alderman of the City of Chicago, the  
 Committeeman of the 24th Ward, Walter Shumpert. Wally,  
 it's good to have you. Very good. Eddie will be 11 May  
 3. Yeah, real good. Mrs. Younge...where's she at?  
 501...House Bill 501. The Lady has leave to return House  
 Bill 501 back from Third to Second. Any objections?  
 Hearing none, 501 is on Second Reading."



Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 501 addresses the problem of the inability of some local school districts to sell their bonds. I have amended the Bill to reach an agreement with the Capital Development Board. First of all, Amendment #4 would change the date from 1980 to 1982 and Amendment #5 would require the Capital Development Board in conjunction with the Department of Education to make a study about this situation. And I move for the adoption of these Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Younge, amends House Bill 501 as amended as so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?'. All in favor vote 'aye'... I'm sorry. All in favor say 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Younge, amends House Bill 501 as amended by deleting all..."

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

Younge: "Amendment #5 becomes a Bill and suggests that the Department of Education and the Capital Development Board make a study as to how these bonds can be sold."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I didn't hear. As I understand it, this Amendment becomes a Bill now. Is that correct?"

Younge: "That's correct."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's what the Lady said."

Leinenweber: "And what does the Bill do?"

Younge: "Alright, it requests that the Capital Development Board in conjunction with the Department of Education and conjunction with local school districts that are having difficulty selling their bonds...engage in a study as to how this situation can be alleviated and it was agreed on by the parties involved."

Leinenweber: "Was this a Bill...was this a previous Bill that is now become this Bill? In other words, are you resur-



recting a former Bill?"

Younge: "The previous Bill was 501, and the Bill is being amended to...rather than to authorize the guarantee of the bonds by the Capital Development Board to authorize that an investigation be made into the problem of the inability to sell the bonds."

Leinenweber: "In other words, they are trying to find out why they can't sell the bonds?"

Younge: "They are trying to find out how...how to sell them. what has to be done to sell all of the bonds...school districts."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Could we have a little order please? Please continue, Sir."

Leinenweber: "In other words, it asks the Capital Development Board to try to find out how these particular school districts can sell their bonds. Is that correct?"

Younge: "That is correct."

Leinenweber: "And...what happens after they find out how they can sell them? Then...is there any provisions that they back the bonds or do anything like that?"

Younge: "No, they are going to make a study to see what has to be done in order to get the bonds sold, and then that study will be made available to the General Assembly for a resolution of the problem, but the first step is to authorize these parties who have agreed to study this problem to come up with a solution."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Further discussion. The question is 'Shall Amendment #4 (sic) be adopted?'. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. Amendment #4 (sic) is adopted. Any further Amendments?" Any further Amendments?"

That was Amendment #5. Well, correct the Board. Amendment #5 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. And it goes back on consideration postponed. House Bill 1566. The Gentleman from Cook,





Mr. Terzich, requests the Bill brought back from Third to Second for the purpose of Amendments. Any objections? Hearing none, the Bill's on Second Reading. 1566, Jack. 66 please. Correct the Board." Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Terzich, amends House Bill 1566 by deleting everything after the enacting clause..."

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

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #1 simply is a technical change changing the effective date from January 1, 1980 to January 1, 1981 since this Bill was not put in last year. That's all the Amendment does, and I move for adoption."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Totten: "Bob, the Clerk said it struck everything after the enacting clause, and you said it was technical and just changed the date."

Terzich: "Well, actually, all it is, it deals with the Chicago police department pension bene...post-retirement benefits, and that's all that was requested on the Amendment. It was just to change the effective date from January 1, 1980 to January 1, 1981."

Totten: "So, it didn't...you're saying it didn't change the subject matter. It just changed the date."

Terzich: "Just the date. That is correct. I've got three Bills doing the same thing the next spring."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?'. All in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed. Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 1567...The Gentleman asks leave to bring the Bill back from Third



to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objections?  
Hearing none, Second Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, ...  
Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Terzich, amends House Bill 1567..."

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

Terzich: "Again, this is a similar Amendment changing the  
effective date to January 1, 1981 rather than January 1,  
1980, and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall  
Amendment #1 be adopted?'. All in favor signify by saying  
'aye', opposed. Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further  
Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Also House Bill 1570. The  
Gentleman has leave to bring the Bill back from Third  
to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objections?  
Hearing none, 1570 is on Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Terzich, amends House Bill 1570  
by deleting everything and so forth."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "This is a simple Amendment through the Chicago  
laborers' retirement fund changing the effective date  
from January 1, 1980 to January 1, 1981. I move for its  
adoption."

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

Beatty: "Representative, these Bills all change the percentage  
from two to three. Is that what they do?"

Terzich: "This is the post-retirement benefit..."

Beatty: "From two to three."

Terzich: "Yes."

Beatty: "Thank you."

Terzich: "Correct."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All in favor signify by saying 'aye',  
'aye', opposed. Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further



Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Would the Gentleman from Edgar, Mr. Woodyard, come up to the rostrum please? Yeah. Woodyard. For the purpose of an introduction, Mr. Woodyard."

Woodyard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It is indeed a privilege for me today to introduce to you the Illinois State Mother of the Year for 1980, Mrs. Pauline Morgan from Rossville, Illinois and her husband, Ralph. She is the mother of ten children. She will be participating next week for the National Mother of the Year in Phoenix, Arizona, and we certainly wish her all the luck in the world from the State of Illinois. Mr. Morgan."

Mrs. Morgan: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Stuffle, Representative Campbell, and Representative Woodyard, other Representatives, Ladies and Gentlemen, and guests, the first thing I would like to do is introduce to you the past State Mothers of the Year, and I am going to ask them to stand. They are up in the left lower...upper gallery. Would you please stand, past State Mothers of the Year? It is with a great deal of appreciation and humility that I accepted this honor as State Mother of 1980, and I am deeply indebted to the Rossville Women's Club for submitting my name as a candidate. I have had certain advantages in gaining this title. With ten years, and nearly 50 years of being a wife and mother, the opportunity for being involved in church, school, and civic organizations is evident. I am thankful that the American Mothers Committee has existed for so long and that it continues to promote high ideals of family life and the moral and spiritual foundations of the home. In a modern world, these qualities may be easily overlooked. The American Mothers Committee Incorporated aims to develop and strengthen the moral and spiritual foundation of the American home and give the observance of Mother's Day...



spiritual quality which highlights the standards of ideal motherhood and recognizes the importance of the mother in the home, the community, and the nation. The annual search for the American Mother is but one important phase of the work of this organization. Others include the young mother's council service, a chapel in every home, prayer groups, annual prayer..., international relations, and U.N. accreditation. I would like to take just a moment to give you a few of my ideas of what it takes to build a home and family. The home has many building blocks. The father is the head of the home, the mother is the heart of the home. The family remains the basis of human relations since it is the family more than any other institution that shapes the personality and the character in each of us. Each family must set its own standard of family life in order to make their home a haven of peace, love, understanding and faith. There must be a foundation for a healthy home. It takes warmth, acceptance, flexibility, communication, commitment, understanding, and security. The family must have a basic trust for each other. As the trust grows, the relationship grows in caring for each other, sharing possessions, burdens, responsibilities, happiness, communication with one another, and honesty among family merit...members. A Christian family must rely on God in erecting and designing the family, God intended the Christian...(malfunction in tape)...essence means the ability to accept each member for what he or she is. I would like to read to you in closing, the philosophy on parenting that I submitted for the American Mothers' Committee. As parents we are like a bow which sends its arrows, our children, into the world. We are the primary source of strength and guidance. We must direct without dominating, encourage without pushing, and teach without preaching. It is important to discover the individual qualities in each child and to support



the church, school, and recreational activities of each. We must encourage them to achieve their own potential and follow their own convictions. A parent must provide an open line of communication while supplying love, understanding, and never ending patience tempered with humor, but most important, parents must set examples for their children to follow. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Also for the purpose of an introduction I would like to introduce to the Membership of this fine Body, an outstanding Member of the City Council of the City of Chicago, the fine Committeeman of the 39th Ward, Alderman Bill Laurino...Tony Laurino. That's Bill's dad. Tony, good to see you. Also you, Tony... With leave of the House, we will go back to Third Readings based upon the requests that were filed with the Speaker, and we will also then complete yesterday's requests and go on today's agenda as well. Mr. Skinner has an objection?"

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I think I do object, and I object for personal reasons. Last spring using this method, I didn't get one Bill called, and I would prefer to go on the order of the Bills as they are listed on the Calendar, and that would give everyone an equal chance of being called rather than just the favorites of whoever happens to be the Speaker at the time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's fine with me. Okay. Where did we leave off? You know, before we go into that, I think we should probably do as House Bills Second Reading first, and then we will go into the order of the calendar. And this way we will have an opportunity to give the Membership...move their Bills to Third Reading for tomorrow. Alright, on page two, House Bills Second Reading Short Debate Calendar appears House Bill 2211, Mr. Schneider. 2211, Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2211, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code, Second Reading of the Bill."



Amendment #1 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, amends House  
Bill 2211 on page one and line one and five and so forth."

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

Schneider: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House,  
this Amendment simply provides for the State Board to  
evaluate the fiscal efficiency and effectiveness of regula-  
lar and voc-ed transportation. I would move for its  
adoption. It is a change from a significant transportation  
Bill which was average cost funding, and so all this re-  
quires now is for its study. I move its adoption."

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." No, there will be objections.  
House Bills Second Reading on page three appears House  
Bill 24."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 24, a Bill for an Act to amend  
Sections of the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of  
Marriage Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1  
was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 515."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 515. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 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, Kane, amends..."

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

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 to House Bill 515 increases the annual monthly retirement annuity from 2% to 3% for IMRF. I would urge the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "What is the projected cost of that increase?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kane."

Kane: "The estimated annual employer contribution would be about nine million six."

Leinenweber: "The cost of the Amendment is nine million six?"

Kane: "Yes."

Leinenweber: "Is this a mandated program?"

Kane: "Yes."

Leinenweber: "Does the state have to pay it then under the Yourell Bill?"

Kane: "If it was passed after...I'm not certain with details of the Yourell Bill, but if it applied, then yes."

Leinenweber: "Well, this is...would seem to me that the Yourell Bill applies, and this would, therefore, foist off on the state this nine million increase."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? Mr. Leinenweber?"

Leinenweber: "No."

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

Terzich: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have the impact statement from the Illinois Pension Laws Commission and what this does is it in-



creases the post-retirement benefit for the IMRF fund and also for the Chicago municipal employees' funds increasing the unfunded liability approximately 130 million dollars. The Amendment was approved...was disapproved by the Pension Laws Commission since it felt that the present level of the IMRF benefits, which is in combination with the social securities benefits, are adequate to meet the members' needs in retirement. The social security portion benef...of the benefits, generally about one-half of the total, is increased annually with the cost of living. So, under the IMRF that they also are covered under social security. They do get their annual cost of living benefits increased in accordance with the price index and, therefore, this is a substantial amount of money that is going to be costing the municipalities for money that, I'm sure, could be used elsewhere in providing more adequate pension benefits than to amend the post-retirement benefit, and I would urge a 'no' vote on Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Sangamon...I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, just to point out, Mr. Speaker and Members, that this is indeed the same type of benefit that we provided two years ago in House Bill 1803 to a number of the other systems raising them from two to three percent. I have no objections to Representative Kane putting this Amendment on my Bill. Further, the Amendment that he offers strikes the rest of the Bill that was originally there, and now this becomes the Bill, and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kane to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's true that this is an Amendment that would cost some additional dollars, but I think that we also have





to remember that there are individuals who have retired who are living on rather small pensions and in a time... in a period when inflation is going at 13 to 18% a year I think it's reasonable that pension benefits should increase three percent a year up from the present two percent. We've done this for other pension systems, and I'd urge the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. All opposed. The Gentleman requests a Roll Call. All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Tommy, vote me 'no'. 'No'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, just to explain my 'no' vote, Mr. Speaker.

As I mentioned before, the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund is one of the very few systems that are coordinated with social security, so, therefore, all of the participants under the IMRF fund do receive a cost of living increase under their pension benefits substantially more than the three percent that we passed for the other systems such as the State Employees' System. And, therefore, the money that we're talking about of 130 million dollars increase in the unfunded liability, and I'm certainly sure that they could use the money to help out the people that require higher benefits at retirement than by putting in a three percent increment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 48 'ayes', 57 'noes', 6 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Kane,..."

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

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 deals with the State Employees Retirement System, and what it does is increase, or give the employees who retired prior to 1969 the three percent annual increase



on their pension benefits rather than the present two percent. It would bring those individuals into parity with the employees who have retired since 1969."

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

Speaker Taylor: "Any discussion? All in favor of Amendment #3 signify by voting 'aye'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Taylor: "Third Reading. Can I have the attention of the House? We are fortunate today to have 'with this Roll Call', a young person from Chicago to come down for the purpose for an introduction. In just a few moments I think they will be marching in the doorway there. It would be the Manley High School, and will the Manley High School enter the chambers? Would the team come right up here on the podium please? For the purpose of this introduction, I will now introduce to you Representative Bill Henry from the 21st District. Representative Henry."

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It gives me a great pleasure to honor...to introduce some of the people that are responsible for this great team being the best from the west in the State of Illinois. I would like to introduce to you my predecessor, Mr. Walter Shumpert, Alderman of the 24th Ward. Mr. Dale 'Curruthers'...Mr. Dale 'Curruthers', Committeeman of the 28th Ward of the west side of the City of Chicago. My colleague from the 20th Legislative District, Representative Doug Huff. And what I just found out, Ladies and Gentlemen, that one of the young men that attended the school lives in the district of my good friend, Representative Clarence Williamson. Also my colleague from the great 21st Legislative District, my good friend, Langdon Patrick. At this time it gives me a great honor and a pleasure, Ladies and Gentlemen, to present to you the principal of the Manley Wildcats



High School, what we call on the great west side, Mr.

'DeNire'. Mr. 'DeNire', principal of Manley High School."

'DeNire': "Ladies and Gentlemen, we take this opportunity to bring you greetings from our parents and voters from the west side of Chicago, and we thank you for this opportunity to share these moments with you, and especially do we want to give thanks to our Representative, William 'Bill' Henry, from the 21st District. Thank you so much for the day's activities. Standing right in front of you, would you say hello to our cheerleaders who took us... helped the guys to the victory. And now will you greet the outstanding coach of the State of Illinois for 1980, Coach Willie 'Loam'."

'Loam': "Alright, I would like to take this time to announce the state championship class AA basketball team of 1980. We will start from our right. This is my right-hand man, my chief manager, Reginold Martin. Behind Reginold is Tim 'Madison', my assistant coach, 'Loren' Dixon, our big guy, Russell 'Cross', my point guard, 'Royce Beirman', I'm having a hard time. Okay, 'Rodell Robison', Micheal 'Buchanan', one of our starters, Ron Washington, and the other starter, 'Lenard Jones'. Next is Tim Anderson's best friend, Vernon Jackson, and our manager, Patrick 'Mulligan'."

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Coach. One other Member that just arrived to the floor of the House of Representatives is my colleague and real good friend, Representative Marco Domico. At this time I would like to thank you very much, Mr. Chairman."

Speaker Taylor: "Before Bill Henry called us to order, it is not often that we have this opportunity to have the cheerleaders, and I think they ought to give us a cheer while they're here. Something new for the House of Representatives. Come on, Girls."

CHEERLEADERS DO A CHEER

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman...the Gentleman from Champaign,



Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My congratulations to the coach, cheerleaders, and all the members of the Manley High School state championship team. On behalf of the University of Illinois in Champaign, I would like to extend the official invitation to Russell 'Cross', all the members of the Manley High School...come join the University of Illinois in winning the Big 10 championship and the NCAA next year."

Speaker Taylor: "Mr. Clerk, will you please read the Resolution?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 670, whereas the Manley High School Wildcats from the west side of Chicago have been crowned state champions of Illinois AA Class basketball, and whereas the Wildcats reached this pinnacle of sports by defeating an excellent squad from Effingham in the recent state tournament; and whereas this victory in a season distinguished by 31 victories and only one defeat was achieved by outstanding efforts and part of a squad blessed with outstanding abilities acting as a tightly knit unit under the direction of Coach Willie 'Little' and the encouragement of Principal Blaine DeNye, Assistant Principals Albert Pratt, Malcolm Hemphill, the faculty, student body, parents and friends; and whereas the Manley Wildcats' championship trophy symbolizes truly the spirit of potential cooperation by citizens of the 20th and 21st Legislative Districts represented in this Body; and whereas tribute is due to individual members of the Manley Wildcats not only for the championship, but also for their demonstration of the highest degree of teamwork and sportsmanship throughout a long season, and we salute Captain Roy Spearman, Timothy Anderson, Russell Cross, Vincent Johnson, Randolph (sic) Washington, Michael Buchanon, Vincent (sic) Jackson, Leonard Jones, William Knight, Craig Pickett, Randall (sic) Roberson, DeWayne Rose, Michael Williams, James Yarboruth, and Willie Hill; be it therefore resolved by the House of Representatives



of the 81st General Assembly of the State of Illinois that we officially and formally commend those outstanding young men, their coaches, faculty, and friends for demonstrating the highest degree of sports excellence; and be it further resolved that a suitable copy of this preamble and Resolution be presented to coach Little and his team as a lasting expression of our esteem."

Speaker Taylor: "You all heard the Resolution. It has been moved by Representative Henry, seconded by Representative Domico that House Resolution 670 be adopted. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. I want to personally thank...the Lady from Cook, Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, as a former cheerleader from the great south side, I would...and in recognition of the tremendous contribution that this team has made, and that this school has made, and that this...this...the activities on behalf of Manley has made for the State of Illinois, I was going to move the Resolution...the acceptance of this Resolution. It has already been adopted. I would just like to offer on behalf of myself and I am sure the other Members of this House, a personal congratulations to the team, to the coach, to the principal, and to the cheerleaders. Thank you."

Speaker Taylor: "Will the team and the cheerleaders retire to the Speaker's chamber right in the back here? The coach and the principal... Second Readings..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the Calendar on page three appears House Bill 929, Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 929, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act, 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 1294...1294."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1294, a Bill for an Act to amend



Sections of the Unemployment Insurance Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments...any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Simms, amends House Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mr. Farley,...is the Gentleman in the chamber? The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Take the Bill out of the record. House Bill 1384."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1384, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Younge..!"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 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, Younge, amends House Bill 1384..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Right, Mr. Speaker, this Amendment which clarifies the language of this Bill and has been written by the Department of Commerce...it makes it clear. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there 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 1414."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1414, a Bill for an Act to authorize the establishment of branches of circuit courts and municipal districts, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 1500."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1500, a Bill for an Act...a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 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, Skinner, amends House Bill 15..."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, the last time we were talking about this Bill that we were...asked...we were...the question was raised whether the word area was appropriate in the definition on page five. I checked with the Department of Revenue, and they assure me that it is an appropriate use of the word."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is that what Amendment #2 does, Sir?"

Skinner: "Well, that was what that contention. All...all Amendment #2 does is change the Department of Local Government Affairs to the Department of Revenue, but someone asked a question about..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay."

Skinner: "...Another part of the Sections."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there 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. 1801."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1801, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Regional Transportation Authority Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 was tabled previously. Floor Amendment #2, Grossi,..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Correct the Board, please. Thank you."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Amends House Bill 1801 as amended by deleting the title and so forth."

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

Grossi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to withdraw Amendment #2, 5, and 15 due to the changes in the law that...were enacted this past summer. I would still like to go with Amendment #16 when that turn comes up."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has leave to withdraw two, five, and fifteen. Hearing no objection, those three Amendments are withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Skinner, amends House Bill 1801 as amended by...on page one and so forth."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this is a miracle that I am sponsoring a Bill that amends the RTA Act. It only occurred because Representative Barnes decided to retire and I was a joint Sponsor. I would ask leave to withdraw Amendment #3, 4...3 and 4...let's see...13...yeah, 3, 4, and 13 because the goals which I sought to accomplish were accomplished in the Thompson-Bynre transportation package."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Cal, which Amendment are you withdrawing now?"

Skinner: "Three, four, and thirteen."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #3, 4, and 13. No objections, the Amendments are withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Deuster, amends House Bill 1801..."

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

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #6 would accomplish what really should have done...been done at the very begining with RTA. It simply





provides that because there is a state interest in the success of this Regional Transportation Authority that the Chairman of the RTA would not be chosen by the Members, but the Chairman would be appointed by the Governor with the confirmant of a three-fifths vote of this House here and of the Senate. I think it...is important that Members of this House as well as Members of the Senate be involved in the decision of who is going to be Chairman of the RTA. The Chairman should be a neutral person and a competent person, and this Amendment would guarentee that we who are sitting here in this chamber help...participate in the selection of the Chairman of the RTA. That is what the Amendment does, and I would urge your support and adoption of it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Brummer: "Is there any precedent for the House getting involved in confirmation of gubernatorial appointments?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's a first."

Deuster: "I don't remember. But I do think..."

Brummer: "Can you think of any other instance where the House confirms an appointee of the Governor?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No."

Deuster: "The...Representative Walsh said that I should say Auditor General, but he doesn't want to be responsible for the reliability of the answer, but I might say this that we shouldn't...whether there is a precedent or not, Representative Brummer, we shouldn't shy from something if it is good and it makes sense. I think we are just as important as the Senate, and the RTA has been such an important agency. We appropriate funds for transportation, and I...I just think we should be involved in it. There is nothing wrong with you and I and the rest of the Members of this chamber participating in the confirmation..."



Brummer: "Are you sure there's no Constitutional problems with that?"

Deuster: "I'm...I'm sure. Schlickman says 'no', too, but very seriously, I see nothing in the Illinois Constitution that would prevent us from participating in this way... and we do...we are involved in the Auditor General, so there is precedence."

Brummer: "Well the Auditor General specifically is a Member of the legislative branch...by Constitution."

Deuster: "Well, we created the RTA, and I think we can do just about anything that we think makes sense as...so long as it doesn't conflict with any clear provision of the Constitution, and I know of none."

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

Beatty: "Mr. Sponsor, could you tell me how the present Chairman is selected?"

Deuster: "Yes, the way the present Chairman is selected is that the...the Members of the RTA Board itself get together and vote on that Chairman, and the problem with that as I see it, is that we have a little clique that develops. There is some little gang that gets together whether it be a city in the suburbs or whatever, and they choose this Chairman, and the Chairman is really beholden to the Members...like I think the four coming from the City of Chicago, or the number from the City of Chicago ought to be responsible to Chicago, the suburbanites and the suburban areas. But the Chairman is supposed to be neutral and impartial and should not be beholden to those Members that he made a deal with to get selected. I think it would just be cleaner and better from the point of view of good government to have the Chairman a neutral person who is not chosen by some of the buddies he is going to be serving with on that Board."

Beatty : "Do you think...does he have to be a Member to be chosen Chairman under your Bill? Will he be a Member first?"



Deuster: "No, under the law the present Chairman isn't a Member first."

Beatty: "But is it the present Member...the present Chairman is a Member. Is that the case?"

Deuster: "No, the Chairman is an extra Member."

Beatty: "Is he a voting Member?"

Deuster: "Oh yes...after he gets on there. Yeah...you see, the problem is it is kind of like the Legislature got together, and we elected a 178th Member and gave him a vote. He would be responsible not to everybody, but he would be responsible to that group here who has put him in power."

Beatty: "Well under your...the present system is that they get together, elect a Chairman, and give him a vote. Is that what you're saying?"

Deuster: "They bring in a new guy. Yeah, they bring in somebody from the outside world, and they give him a vote, and he knows who put him in office."

Beatty: "And your system wants to change that and have the Governor put a new guy in with you and me and all of us here voting with a three-fifths vote to confirm him."

Deuster: "Yes, Sir."

Beatty: "And we give him a vote...we give him a vote under your system?"

Deuster: "That's right. Yes, Sir...except he is answerable to the State of Illinois as we represent here..."

Beatty: "Well the reason..."

Deuster: "This is, I might say, Representative Beatty, this is consistent with the way regional transportation systems are set up in most other states that I know of."

Beatty: "Well, since this is a regional matter, it seems to me to be better for the people in the region who are up there and trying to run the Board that they should be responsible rather than bringing the Governor of the State of Illinois in...and I..."

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

VanDuyne: "Thank you. Mr. Deuster, this reminds me of the



merits selection of judges Bill where taking it away from the people and putting it in the hands of the law...the lawyers of the state, and ultimately in the hands of the most political animal in the world, the Governor. Now with that in the back of your mind, do you think that really making a deal with the Governor makes it a little less political than the other eight Members of the RTA? Now I am a Member...I live in a county that is a Member of the RTA. We have been fighting to expand that so Will County will have a Member on the Board and have some governing powers, but I find it a little bit more cleaner, as you put it, to have the person appointed by those other eight people, or at least the deal made with those other eight people, if we had a man representing our district, at least he would still be responsible to us where if you separated out of sight out of mind further away you get the less control you have...you would only be responsible really to the Governor, and I don't understand the philosophy really. Mainly I am talking about a philosophy here. How can you say that it is cleaning anything up by taking it away from one group and giving it to another?"

Deuster: "Well, Representative VanDuyne, under my Amendment here, you, and I, and everybody in this chamber are going to have a shot at making sure that that Chairman and that RTA is responsive to the needs of the people that vote for you and the people who vote for me..."

VanDuyne: "I think that's a statement which I..."

Deuster: "That's right."

VanDuyne: "...Because it is not true. The Governor would have his 78 people over there would vote in mass, and then Madigan and whoever else who is making the deal over on this side would provide the other part of the three-fifths. Now I don't know what..."

Deuster: "If you've got a problem with Representative Madigan..."

VanDuyne: "No..."



Deuster: "...That's beyond me, but..."

VanDuyne: "No, he's my Leader, and I trust him, but fact is still fact."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Now that the Gentleman's name has been mentioned in this debate, I'll call on the Majority Leader from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment. He proposes to...make a radical change in the current complexion of the RTA Board. The area of the Board to which this Amendment is offered has not been the source of any controversy since the creation of the RTA. There has been a great deal of controversy regarding the RTA, but never has there been any complaints about the selection of the Chairman. Today the incumbent Board Members meet among themselves, select one of their Members to be the Chairman. There has been no complaints <sup>re</sup> this process. Additionally given the recent changes in funding for the RTA, today there is very little state financial involvement with the RTA. Most of the money supporting that agency is derived locally, and in light of that, I see no reason why the Governor and the Legislature should be involved in the selection of the Chairman. If the bulk of the financing is done locally, then certainly the selection of the Chairman could be done locally, and for those reasons, I would stand in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to close. You can explain your votes."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think everyone understands what this Amendment does. It will involve us in the decision making. Some people say Members of this House don't have enough influence. We are the ones who get complaints the buses aren't running whether they be in the City of Chicago or in the suburbs. This Amendment will give us an opportunity to



be involved in the decision making. I think every Member of the House who knows that RTA is important and who wants the Chairman to be fair...the Chairman to be responsive will support this Amendment. And although Milton 'Pucharski' is gone, I must say that the distinguished Majority Leader has a convenient member... memory...if he does not remember the great controversy over the Chairman, Milton 'Pucharski', who was regarded by many people as being a total catastrophe in that office. And sure 'Pucharski' is gone, but I think this Amendment will assure that we continue to have the present good service that we have in the Chairman of the RTA, and that we will be involved in...to some extent in running that fine transportation authority, and I urge your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?'. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'no'. 'Nos' have it. Any further Amendments? Amendment's lost."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #7, Skinner, amends House Bill 1801 as amended."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment requires the RTA to file a crime statistics report with the General Assembly on April 1 of each odd-numbered year. I think crime is still a problem on the CTA, and I think we probably ought to keep...on the RTA and its subsidiaries, and I think we ought to be kept in touch. This sort of is the intent of the original Bill."

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

Madigan: "Question of the Sponsor."

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

Madigan: "Is there any estimate available as to the costs of preparing and filing these reports?"

Skinner: "Well, I assure you it will cost no more this year than when Representative Barnes made the suggestion. I don't know."



Madigan: "Whose suggestion was this?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Barnes, Gene Barnes."

Skinner: "It was Representative Barnes' suggestion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Move the adoption of the Amendment? The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments? ..."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #8, Walsh, amends House Bill 1801 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh. Bill Walsh, 20 years."

Walsh: "Twenty years. Twenty long years, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #8 is one that does no harm whatever to the RTA. As a matter of fact, it makes it a more effective unit of government. It was pointed out earlier in debating another Amendment that the funding for the Regional Transportation Authority comes almost entirely from the area that is served by that Authority. In breaking it down a little more, the funding comes disproportionately from suburban Cook County. Now, Mr. Speaker, suburban Cook County gets very little service from the Chicago Transit Authority. Outside of suburban Cook County in the five outlining counties there is no service from the Chicago Transit Authority and yet the RTA spends, as I understand it, some 70 to 75% of its funding on the CTA. Now, Mr. Speaker, this makes for an administrative nightmare that the CTA gets this funding and is not answerable at all to the people from whom it gets the funding. I suggest to you that there ought to be one agency that governs mass transportation in the metropolitan area and that agency should be the Regional Transportation Authority. This Amendment simply does that. It abolishes the CTA and makes the RTA the operating authority for the CTA, and I move the adoption of Amendment #8."



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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Cook County and I have a severe policy disagreement. I trust Gene Barnes more than I do Lou Hill, and frankly, if we are going to abolish anything we ought to be abolishing the RTA and leaving the CTA. At least the CTA operates with some semblance of efficiency. The RTA does not. So I stand to oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer."

Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would really like to agree with Representative Skinner and abolish RTA and keep CTA, but I know we can't do that, so I rise in support of my colleague from the 6th District and his Amendment to abolish CTA. Everything he said is absolutely right. We don't get the good service, but we share in the cost, and why should we have two governing Bodies over one transportation system...that is essentially one. I think Mr. Walsh's Amendment is a very good one."

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

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am rising to oppose Mr. Walsh's Amendment. CTA and RTA enter into a contractual agreement like any other carrier that RTA would enter into. I think if we would kill anything we should kill RTA, and let's not lose sight of the fact that CTA carried 667 riders last year and was funded only 22¢ for each rider when we see other carriers in the system getting three and four times that amount and they don't even have the ridership to even capture the subsidy dollar. If we should kill anybody it should be RTA. Believe me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's address the Amendment. It's not a bad Amendment. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my differences with Sponsor Skinner and with Representative





Huff,...are differences in semantics that they want to kill the RTA. Let them kill the RTA and rename the operating authority in Chicago CTA again, or MTA, or whatever. I appreciate the kind words of my colleague, Mrs. Willer. She is absolutely right. Again we have an administrative nightmare. We have an agency that is funding another agency. The agency being funded is not answerable at all, and I urge you to vote 'yes' on this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is 'Shall Amendment #8 be adopted?'. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #9, Macdonald, amends House Bill 1801 on page one by deleting line one and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Whose Amendment? Whose...Amendment #9. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table Amendment #9."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady withdraws Amendment #9. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #10, Dyer, amends House Bill 1801..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to table Amendment #10 and 11."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady withdraws #10 and 11. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #12, Hudson, amends House Bill 1801."

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

Hudson: "Hudson please."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #12 is a very modest Amendment. What it does is to permit counties within the RTA region to disconnect on...by action or with action of the County Board and with approval of the voters of that county. Now, I think in presenting this Amendment it



would be well for me, perhaps, to say a few words in way of historical overview here. It should be remembered, I think, that when the RTA was established by the Illinois General Assembly or voted on by the voting public in the six counties, that the voters in the six counties... in five counties at least, did not approve the RTA. In some counties the vote was outstandingly against the RTA, Lake County, DuPage County, McHenry, Will,...but it is possible that since that time, the people have for one reason or another taken a different point of view...regards the RTA. I don't honestly know. But it seems to me to be only fair, and I might mention, too, that suburban Cook County...the voters in suburban Cook County did not vote for the RTA either. So it seems to me that it is only in the interest of fairness that the members of any given county should be given a chance to opt out of this form of regional government if that should be their wish, based on the fact that they may not feel the services are adequate or indeed any services at all. But I would ask you, Ladies and Gentlemen, to give consideration...good consideration... to this Amendment in the interest of fairness. And I would therefore urge your support of Amendment #12 to Representative Skinner's Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I lie in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment. It would provide that a county within the RTA...RTA region could disconnect from the RTA. The underlying argument on behalf of this proposal has always been that the collar counties have not received in return their fair share of the amount of money they contribute to the operation of the RTA. In light of the transportation package of last year, this financial inequity no longer exists. And statistics which are available for everyone's scrutiny clearly shows



that the amount of money returned to those collar counties is commensurate with the contributions that they make to the support of the RTA. And for those reasons, I would stand in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment."

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

Skinner: "It is amazing how the Majority Leader and I can look at the same set of facts and come up with a different conclusion. At the present time, I would argue that Cook County no longer needs the collar counties...because we do not subsidize Cook County transportation in any way, you should not fear to allow our people to have self-determination. This is a hard process that is being proposed. It will require a county board Resolution and after that it will require a referendum of the people, and it has to be done by 1982. Cook County loses nothing if this Amendment is adopted, and I hope the people from Cook County will vote for it, and I hope those people from downstate who owe some of us people in the collar counties a bit of penance for their votes for the transportation package last year will also vote for it."

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

Hudson: "...You, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me to be abundantly clear that the case of the RTA and these collar counties should go to the people. If, as our Majority Leader has said, the RTA is providing the services, the money allocations are fair, everything else is right about the RTA, there should be no fear then to put the proposal before the people. I think that the people in those collar counties, as Representative Skinner has already said, have a perfect right to take another look, and if they are satisfied...if they are satisfied, and the RTA has proved its case in those collar counties including the county of DuPage from which I come, then the RTA has nothing to fear. The people will go to the polls, and



they will vote for retaining the RTA. But on the other hand, if they have reason to believe that the system has not provided them the services that it promised them...that it promised them, then they have the option to do something else. And I believe, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that the time has come when we provide our voters...much talk has been made here today of the voters' rights and considering the people involved I think the time has come to give them that chance. And if we don't give them that chance, it appears to me that what we're saying...what we are saying is that people of the collar counties, you are locked into a form of regional government from which there is no escape. You are in a cage and no matter how mad...no matter how much you rattle the bars and you shake sticks at the bars of this cage, you're there to stay, and you have no way out. I don't feel that this is a reasonable or an equitable way to treat the people in the collar counties. Give them a chance. The RTA has nothing to fear. I repeat, if it has been doing its job, and, Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to request a Roll Call vote on this particular Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is 'Shall Amendment #12 be adopted?'. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to add my voice in support of this Amendment. After all, you know this is the way it was supposed to be initially. Before the deviousness of the people who perpetrated this RTA on the six...other five collar counties outside of Cook...took over in 1974...1973 whenever it was. That was the way it was supposed to be anyway. Each county was supposed to get the referendum on their own, and they were going to...supposed to have the right to judge whether or not to go in until, as I say, the deviousness took over, and I think there is nothing wrong with...at



this late date from giving them their right to choice."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk...yes... Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Record Capuzi as 'no'. What's the count? On this...The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman...wants to be recorded as 'no'. Mr. Bowman from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. Donovan... 'no'. Mr. Marovitz, 'no'. Harris, 'no'. What's the count, Jack? Mr. Preston as 'no'. Mr. Ebbesen as 'aye'. Mr. Walsh...change Mr. Walsh from 'present'...I'm sorry, from 'aye' to 'present'. Mr. Robbins as 'aye'. Mr. Rigney as 'aye'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Kindly record Mr. Richmond as 'no'. Mrs. Balanoff as 'no'. He's 'no'. What's the count, Jack? On this question there are 71 'ayes', 77 'nos', and the Amendment is defeated. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #13 was withdrawn previously. Amendment #14, Skinner, amends House Bill 1801 as amended..."

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

Skinner: "I'm sorry, this Amendment has also been already accomplished, so I withdraw it also."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #14. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #15 was withdrawn previously. Amendment #16, Grossi, amends House Bill 1801..."

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

Grossi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #16 is a people's Amendment. Basically what this Amendment provides is that the over 6,000,000 people of the RTA region would have their RTA Board elected. At the present time, the RTA Board is appointed. This Bill would simply provide that where they are now appointed from, they would be elected from. Those Representatives from Chicago that serve on the RTA Board would still be from Chicago because they would be elected from Chicago. There will be no change in the make-up of where



the Board would come from. The only difference is that they would be elected. They would be responsible to the people of their district."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I strongly urge that we support the Gentleman's Amendment here. I tried to put a Bill...I put a Bill in several years ago to accomplish just this. The temporary acting Speaker helped torpedo that Bill in Committee. Now we have seen a continuing effort on the part of people in government to try to take away from the people the right to chose the people that make decisions which govern their lives. Right...right across the rotunda yesterday there was an effort made...successful effort made to provide that judges would be appointed rather than elected. Now we've got to stop this, and where we have a chance we ought to regress and let the people elect the people that are going to make the decisions. This Amendment provides that the RTA Board will no longer be appointed and must be responsible therefore to the people it is intended to serve. It is a fine Amendment. I think we should start right now to provide that people can actually vote on those people who are going to govern them, and I urge that we support this Gentleman's motion."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, we're playing who do you trust here today. If you trust the Mayor of Chicago to make decent decisions for the City of Chicago, you want to defeat this Amendment. If, however, you trust your own constituents or your ability to control your own constituents more than you trust your ability to control the Mayor of Chicago, you ought to vote for this Amendment. Minorities ought to think fairly seriously



about how their representation might be improved in the City of Chicago if this Amendment is adopted. There will be separate elections for half the Members of the RTA Board within the City of Chicago, and the outlying areas will be elected in their separate jurisdictions. I think if we are going to abolish the CTA, we ought to... we certainly ought to give Chicago a chance to control the CTA...or control the RTA as they now control the RTA, and that is done through this Amendment because the Chairman will be elected at large. If you can produce more people at the polls, than we can produce, you win. If you can't you lose. You've got a chat... do you trust the people. That is the question. Are you willing to role the dice or would you rather maintain your tight control of the RTA without a...without and type of electoral interference?"

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

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just wanted to correct the previous Speaker who's our resident expert on transportation. Certainly the culprit in this regard is not only the Mayor of the City of Chicago, but a Representative of his own Party on the second floor."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment. Certainly there are instances in our governmental structure where officials in offices should be elected. However, I see no need in the case of the RTA to incur the cost of electing the Members of that Board. The agency is responsible for the disbursement of monies collected through mass transit carriers operating within that region. Additionally, they are responsible for scheduling and for some of the other relationships between the carriers. In my mind, those duties are not the type of duties which require election



by the people. If the concern is for representation from all of the areas of the region, that was accomplished with the adoption of the transportation package of last year. I see no need for the Amendment. I would suggest to you that it would simply...it would simply amount to an undue increase in the operating costs of the agency, and for those reasons I would oppose the Amendment."

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

Goodwin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the 'Second Wards' kindly hold it before they go out the door? I would like to take this opportunity to introduce the 'mighty Second Ward' from the southside of Chicago, the mother ward. We've got Alderman Butch 'Barnett' up there and the delegates to the Democratic State Convention. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield, Alderman Barnett, my fellow Democrat."

Goodwin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're welcome. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock. Bullock. Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to say that the Gentleman we introduced last week who is also seated in my seat again today who is now an election commissioner in Chicago for some 36 years served as the president of that great organization that State Representative Goodwin just introduced, and by happenstance he is down here today, and I think we ought to give him a round of applause since his family is here with him today, former Representative 'Cornell A. Davis'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "'Deacon', it's always a pleasure. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I know that this might be a violation of the rules, but I would like to presume upon the time of the





House to briefly introduce 34 Members of the Worth Township Regular Democratic Organization who are here in Springfield as delegates to the State...Na...State Convention sitting in the Democratic side of the balcony."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Grossi, to close."

Grossi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In moving the House to adopt this Amendment I would like to point out several things. First the Majority Leader has indicated that costs of an election should be taken into consideration. I would point out that there is a pattern when it comes to appointive governments. That pattern is reflected in the Chicago School Board and in the RTA. That pattern is a Body exceeding its expenditures...or exceeding its costs... rather...where a Body spends more than it takes in. I would also like to point out that the Gentleman has indicated that the RTA Board is presently responsive. I would like to point out the complaints that I have received in my district indicating municipal officials have complained to the RTA Board Members that there are buses in their district that they have not been consulted about. Buses on bus routes that do not actually serve the people...buses that have no one on them except for the bus driver. Every school child has heard the phrase 'no taxation without representation'. I ask that you help make that the law of this...for the RTA."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is 'Shall Amendment #16 be adopted?'. All in favor say 'aye', opposed. Roll Call has been requested. All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Larry, give me...'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 78 'ayes', 68 'nos'. The Amend-



ment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane, what purpose do you seek recognition? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Rule 18K and in light of the adoption of Amendment #8 to this Bill which is an Amendment to the title, I request that this Bill be placed on the order of Second Reading First Legislative Day."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Parliamentarian come back to the rostrum? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yeah, my chief of obfuscator, Representative Collins, is now looking in the rule book. When he finds his objection he...I hope you will recognize him. I would...I would, however, ask why do people...why the Representative from Chicago is so insecure? He surely doesn't think that that Bill will pass, does he? And if it does pass, he surely doesn't think that we can get a Majority, does he? Or does he?"

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

VanDuyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When the Parliamentarian gets here would you have him explain explicitly to us what effect Mr. Madigan's motion would have on the Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave for a consideration to put the Bill back on Second Reading First Legislative Day pursuant to 34D. He has the mic...right to make the request. 34D...The Bill will be returned to Second Reading First Legislative Day. Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend...to suspend the provisions of Rule 34D and advance the Bill to Third Reading."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On that question the Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Well, Mr. Speaker. I just want to remind you of my



request to have the Parliamentarian at least give us an explanation of what Mr. Madigan's motion would do to the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It would...bring the Bill back to Second Reading, would be read two more times with the amended title."

VanDuyne: "Now I...Mr. Speaker, I beg your indulgence. I just have a kind of a sneaky feeling that it would have some effect. It would kill the Bill...or something. Am I close to being correct?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It depends upon the work load of the House."

VanDuyne: "Then fine, I support Representative Collins' position."

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

Grossi: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Collins made the motion that I was concerned about."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's motion to suspend this rule. The rule was placed in our rules in order to allow the House to have time to digest a Bill after an Amendment of this magnitude, and in light of that, Mr. Speaker, I would urge a 'no' vote against the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is 'Shall Representative Collins' motion prevail?'. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Marco, vote me 'no', please." Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 74 'ayes', 56 'nos'. The Gentleman's motion does not prevail. Do you want to call the absentees? Call the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Balanoff, Bluthardt..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mrs. Balanoff as 'no'. Stanley as 'aye'. Stanley as 'aye'. Continue with the absentees please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Brummer, Capuzi, Chapman, John Dunn, Flinn, Garmisa, Hallstom, Johnson, Emil Jones, Kelly, Klosak, Kucharski, Leverenz, Margulas, McAuliffe, McCourt, Molloy,



..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Hanahan: "I'm sorry, my switch accidentally got switched to 'no'. I would like to change it to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Record him as 'aye', please. I'm sorry, who? Dr...Dr...Mr...Repre...Mr. Capuzi. Kindly record Mr. Capuzi as 'aye'. Mrs. Chapman as 'no'. Mr. Brummer as 'aye'. Mrs. Hallstrom as 'aye'. Mr. Mulcahey as 'aye'. Why don't we finish with the absentees? It makes it very difficult for the Clerk to be interrupted and make sure we've got all the changes properly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Poll of the Absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mugalian, O'Brien, Peters, Pierce..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "O'Brien votes 'no'...O'Brien."

Clerk O'Brien: "Rea,..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Rea, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ryan, Sandquist..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Sandquist, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Satterthwaite, Schlickman, Schraeder, Schuneman, Slape,..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Slape, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Stearney, VonBoeckman, Williams, Williamson. No further."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright, now Mr. Neff wanted to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Wolf...I'm sorry, Mr. Sam Wolf...Sam McGrew as 'no'...no. Mr. Mugalian as 'no'. Mr. Kelly as 'aye'. Anyone else? McCourt, 'aye'. Anyone else? I don't know. What's the count, Jack? On this question there are 82 'ayes', 71 'nos'. The Gentleman's motion does not prevail. Mr. Madigan's motion is in order. The House Bill...House Bill 1801 is on Second Reading First Legislative Day. House Bill 1920."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1920, a Bill for an Act permitting the purchase of funeral and cemetary merchandise, or services prior to death, Second Reading of the Bill."



Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Bullock, amends House Bill 1920 as amended."

Speaker Lechowicz: "At the request of the Sponsor, he wants the Bill out of the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Somebody over on this side of the aisle ordered a pack of cigarettes, and the page cannot find the individual. Somebody ordered a pack of Newports. We found them Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Send them to the RTA. 2104, Schneider... Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2104, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Board of Higher Education, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #2 and 3 were adopted previously."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Schneider, amends House Bill 2104..."

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

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Amendment brings into 2104 language which is similar to Illinois State Scholarship Commission which last year added a student to its Board. What this Amendment would do in effect is add a voting Member to the Board of Higher Education using the same language as that of the ISSC. I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?'. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. The question is 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?'. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed



vote 'no'. Penny, you've got a strong voice. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 56 'ayes', 25 'nos', 3 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. 2227."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "You want to take it out of the record..."

Have we already did it? 2272, Mr. Kane. Kane-Schneider. The Gentleman...the Amendment is not ready, take it out of the record. 2341, Mr. Kane, out of the record. 2349, Mr. Ropp..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2349, a Bill for an Act...a Bill for an Act...correcting the Director of Conservation to convey certain real properties, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #...Amendment #1 was adopted previously."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "We've acted on this Bill previously. The next Amendment...there is a motion here to...table Amendment #5. Amendment #5 was adopted previously... here we go. Amendment #2, 3, 4 was withdrawn, 5 was adopted previously. There is a motion to table Amendment #5..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ropp, why don't we take this Bill out of the record until we get it squared away. We'll get right back to it. We'll get right back to it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a motion on the Clerk's table dealing with the deadline for posting Committees next week. The motion would provide that the deadline for Committee posting for next weeks Committees would be extended until tomorrow at 12 noon. This



would allow for the posting of the Bills which were approved by the Rules Committee today, and I move for the adoption of that motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House suspend the provisions of Rule 18K to allow all Committees until Friday, April 25 at noon to post for the Committee meetings for the week of April 29, 1980. Leave to use the Attendance Roll Call. Hearing no objections the Attendance Roll Call will be used. Just to notify... the Chair has been notified that also a former Member of the House and also now a trustee of the Metropolitan Sanitary District, Chester Majewski is here with us today. Chester, welcome to Springfield. Thank you. We're on Second Reading. Tony, are we...are we on 2349 now? Not yet. Alright, we'll get to...2528."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2528, a Bill for an Act abolishing certain units of local government, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 2823."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2823, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Inheritance and Transfer Tax Law, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?:"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?" 2823, Chalk."

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Pierce, amends House Bill 2823 as amended in Section 3A and so forth,"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Pierce. Take the Bill out of the record. House Bill 2860." Mr. Capparelli."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2860, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act, Second Reading of the Bill."



Amendment #2, previously adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 2861."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2861, a Bill for an Act to reduce the State Occupation and Use Tax on food for human consumption and prescription and non-prescription medicine, drugs, medicine, and appliances and diabetic supplies, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. 2892."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2892, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Sumner, amends House Bill 2892 on page two and line 30 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is just a technical Amendment to clean up the Bill...put it in order."

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

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. 2905."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2905, a Bill for an Act to amend the





Illinois Act on Aging, Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Bring the Bill back to Second Reading. There is...it brought to our attention there is an Amendment on the floor. The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Anderson, amends House Bill 2905 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please correct the Board."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #1 to House Bill 2905... it...2905 is the authorization Bill for the appropria... appropriation Bill 2906 which is on Third Reading. This will bring 2905 in compliance with the appropriation Bill, and I would appreciate an 'aye' 'vote.'"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? On the Amendments... all in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. Amendment #1 is adopted. It has been brought to the Chair's attention that there is another Amendment in the process, and we will keep the Bill on Second Reading. It is in the process of being printed. Yes...House Bill 3002."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3002, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Comptroller, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Matijevich, amends House Bill 3002 on page one, line one, and so forth."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 has been cleared with the other side of the aisle. It is a mere \$2,400 Amendment for social security payments to go along with personal service disbursements to retired employees of state agencies which are due lump sum payments. I move for the adoption of Amendment #1 to



House Bill 3002."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?'. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 3104."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3104, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. 3107."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3107, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to state finance, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. On the Calendar on page nine appears House Bill 2657. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino, requested to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objections? Hearing none the Bill is on Second Reading. 2657."

Clerk Leone: "Any Amendments? Any Amendments? Gordon...are they squaring away your Bill? We'll go back to it...go back to it next if they are ready."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, McClain-Madigan-Barnes, amends House Bill 2657..."

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

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 which has support of the Sponsor of the Bill is cosponsored by myself, and



Mr. Madigan, and Jane Barnes. The Bill would set up a capital development program for private higher educational facilities. As you recall before, the House passed it overwhelmingly, and the Senate passed it last year. Unfortunately, the Governor vetoed it. We have discussed the Bill previously, and I would ask for the support of the House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?'. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. ...Let's get back to Mr. Ropp. On page three, House Bill 2349...Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2349, the Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee. Number 2, Representative Ropp's Amendment was adopted on the floor. Three, Yourell's Amendment was withdrawn. Four, Schraeder's Amendment was withdrawn. And Amendment #5, Schraeder's Amendment was adopted. We now have a motion on Amendment #5 by Representative Ropp to table Amendment 5."

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

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, what this particular Bill's original intent is to convey that back in 1964 a certain railroad in the State of Illinois, by written letter, told the adjacent property owners that they would have first right of refusal on that particular property when it became abandoned. Within four months after that period, the railroad, by some means, was persuaded to give it to the Peoria Park Foundation which in turn over a period of three to four years after the state refused to accept it, finally did take it on. Many of these farmers, if not all of them and community people from the four cities in which this area runs, were very much



disenchanted with the movement by the railroads and later by the state when they accepted this particular 26½ mile right-of-way which is only 100 feet wide at its widest which is broken 35 times by country roads and four communities was..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Schraeder: "Point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would like to inquire that this motion is in order. This motion... the Speaker that is making the motion voted on the losing side, and I would like to know if that is in order for him to make the motion that it be reconsidered?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "You are correct, Sir. There was a roll call vote, and somebody on the prevailing side would have to move to reconsider. The Gentleman's motion is not in order. What else?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, Ropp,..."

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

Ropp: "I would like to withdraw Amendment #6."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #6."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #7, Ropp."

Ropp: "I would like to withdraw Amendment #7."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He withdraws Amendment #7."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, Ropp, amends House Bill 2349 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "I would like to move that Amendment #8 be adopted, and what that Amendment actually does, it cleans up the language in the Bill and deals specifically with the subject that pertains to an existing abandoned right-of-way which that State of Illinois has not been involved in making any further development for the last three and one half to four years. The Amendments as...were placed on this Bill actually deal in no way with like situations. It exists with ongoing active fund providing facilities for recreational parks in the State of Illinois; and this



particular issue deals entirely with 288 acres of abandoned right-of-way. There has been a study which has been...which has had several hearings throughout the state which deals with abandoned right-of-ways, and I certainly would like this Amendment passed so that it can be a part of the record so that later on, whatever comes in terms of what position the state should play with abandoned railroads would be given con...consideration. This particular Amendment is a very important Amendment because it deals with integrity of a particular profession, and it also provides that landowners whose property is actually cut in two in every situation might be restored to its original homestead. I urge a favorable vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, on Amendment #8."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if this motion is in order in view of the fact that #5 was adopted by this Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "According to the Parliamentarian, the answer is yes. The Amendment is in order because it does amend the Bill as amended."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It strikes everything after the enacting clause."

Schraeder: "Does it put it back in the shape of the original Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Sponsor have to answer that, Sir. Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Yes, it improves the present situation of that Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, that doesn't respond to the Gentleman's question."

Ropp: "Yes...yes, Sir."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that that motion is not in order, but if that is the ruling of the Chair let me say this...the history given, and I didn't object



to time because I thought it would just as well clear the air and let the Sponsor of the legislation speak his piece, but we have here a piece of property that was purchased by the Forrest Park Foundation from the Rock Island Railroad after it had decided and had permission from the Commerce Commission to abandon it, purchased the property, and it was given to the State of Illinois under the rights under law. The...Forrest Park Foundation originally requested a right of retention or reversion, I should say, if the state was going to then give up the rights of the property. But the Attorney General...the same Attorney General we have now, said that the state could not accept the property with that stipulation. Negotiations followed and the Rock Island...or the Forrest Park Foundation then agreed with the Attorney General that they would strike the part of the agreement that there was no reversion clause. At a later date, approximately two years, the State of Illinois changed the ruling, the same Attorney General, and said yes, they could now put in a reversion clause. But it was too late because the contract was binding, and so on the recommendation of the then Attorney General and the now present Attorney General, the Rock Island Trail was given to the state without a reversionary clause. And it would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that this was a gift by philosophic organizations for the benefit of the citizens of the State of Illinois. And we've hashed this out time and time again. There have been improvements on this trail. The funding has been slow but only because the state funds have not been available in the amount that we would like it to progress. And let me say...and the most important thing about this Rock Island Trail, at the moment, is the fact that we are still negotiating with the State of Illinois, with the Rock Island Trail Association, between the 'Ciara' Clubs and those interested



in conservation and recreation within the State of Illinois. This is not an abandoned trail. It is a trail that is viable and usable. There has been money in the past appropriated for the improvement of it, and it would be my hope, and I met with the Rock Island Trail Property Association as late as three or four months ago, and we are attempting to resolve this within the structure of the district in which I reside with the trail owners and with the State of Illinois, and I think the adoption of this Amendment would certainly be premature and would be a hinderance to the...this type of progress that is being named. It seems to me that once the state has valuable property for greenery and for the use of the entire State of Illinois, that this Amendment should be defeated, and it should be retained in the present form of the Bill as it is now, and I would ask a resounding 'no' vote."

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

Speaker Taylor: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't hear the first part of that. Would the Sponsor yield to a couple of questions?"

Speaker Taylor: "He indicates that he will."

Leverenz: "Does your Amendment #8, in effect, take off Amendment #5?"

Ropp: "You're reading it correctly."

Leverenz: "That was on a roll call vote?"

Ropp: "Adopted...Amendment #5. I'm not..."

Leverenz: "...To the Sponsor of the Amendment."

Ropp: "I don't recall whether it would."

Leverenz: "Alright, the vote was 74 'yes', 63 'no', two voting 'present'. How much money has the state already invested or spent on that piece of property?"

Ropp: "To the best of my findings, \$330,000 to three culverts that were put in incorrectly by the Department of Con-



ervation."

Leverenz: "What would happen to all the money that we've spent on that project already?"

Ropp: "The culverts were to be replaced anyway, and the money that is actually spent on there has been primarily for the culverts. And what we're talking about is spending something close to \$3,000,000 additional dollars to development. Not only to say that amount of money that is... that amount of additional adjacent land that is being considered under a master plan to condemn and take in the future development of 100 foot piece of property 26½ miles long which incumbers 53 miles of fencing which will have to be put at the tune of \$2,000,000... that's state tax dollars."

Leverenz: "Where does...where does that \$2,000,000 figure come from?"

Ropp: "It comes from the material that I have that was drafted by the Department of Conservation as a long term plan for the development of that particular piece of property in 1967 which I am sure has escalated fantastically due to the increased costs of everything."

Leverenz: "Would your Amendment #8 provide that the trees that were taken down by some town up there be replaced?"

Ropp: "There will be no need to replace the trees as it would be placed in the corn fields and soybean fields."

Leverenz: "And is there now may be a change in that funding mechanism that we won't need all the tax dollars since there is a..a voluntary contributory fund established?"

Ropp: "To the best of my knowledge there is no law that permits any voluntary contributions to this and as letters from the Director of Conservation very clearly stated about a year ago that no voluntary funds on behalf of the adjacent property owners could be used for anything. Therefore, it is unlawful for the adjacent property owners to do it, certainly I would think it would be unlawful for any other additional voluntary contributions to come





forward."

Leverenz: "I think you're...you have that maybe backwards. Who is receiving contributions for the voluntary contributions?"

Ropp: "I don't recall ever voting on anything that permitted that in this chamber."

Leverenz: "Well, that is in your area. I thought you would know who I could contribute to."

Ropp: "I'm sure you could contribute to the adjacent property owners, and they would be happy to use your funds to restore the land to good agricultural production."

Leverenz: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Mr. Ropp, as I understand it, this Amendment puts the Bill back in the original shape and transfers the land back to the adjacent landowner. Is that generally correct?"

Ropp: "Yes, Sir."

VanDuyne: "Well, if I could speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker This thing, if nothing else, you have to admire the Bill if not the Sponsor for tenacity. I have been in this ...I've been in this illustrious House for six years. My first year on the Environment, Energy, and Natural Resouces Committee, this Bill reared its ugly head then. In subsequent conversations and action by this Legislature we deemed it proper that the state does retain title to this if nothing more than to keep 26 miles of future very, very, very valuable right-of-way. If you just disdainfully throw this thing away for a paltry or a miniscule amount of money, someday, later on in the future you may come...come back and try to buy it back, and I guarentee you the price will escalate even more than Representative Ropp alludes to. I have talked to Representative Ropp not over two hours ago, and...and I thought he was in agreement that rather than sell it...that you develop a contract with the State



of Illinois and the adjacent property owners and let those people use this, but that the state still retains title, and I...I was of the opinion that he agreed with that if the language could be worked out. So I...I reluctantly oppose...well, I am reluctant in...in you know, coming to the conclusion that he was insincere when we were ta...in our conversation, but I oppose the legislation. I hope to good God that there is somebody in this Legislature will look forward 15...20 years from now or even 30 or 40. The land will cost you nothing to keep. Let the people who are adjacent use it. Let them fence it. Let them farm it. Let them do whatever they want to, but my God, keep this right-of-way. It may cost us literally millions and millions of dollars someday if we ever try to get it back."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

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

Speaker Taylor: "He indicates that he will."

Tuerk: "Well now as I understand it, this Amendment #8 puts the Bill back in the original shape. Does that mean that you have removed Amendment #2 from the language in the Bill as well as Amendment #5 by this Amendment?"

Ropp: "Amendment #5 has been excluded. Numbers one and two are a part of Amendment #8 now."

Tuerk: "I see. In other words, what you're doing in effect is removing Representative Schraeder's Amendment which was adopted by this House last spring." Is that correct?"

Ropp: "That's correct...that's correct because that particular Amendment deals with existing ongoing parks already being enjoyed by people throughout a portion of the state."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, may I address the Amendment then?"

Speaker Taylor: "Proceed."

Tuerk: "Under the circumstances, the House spoke last spring in adopting Representative Schraeder's Amendment because,



in the wisdom of the House, they felt that this would be the proper course to pursue. There has been a great deal of controversy surrounding this particular project. Whether or not it should ever be built is another question. Whether or not it should ever revert back to the property owners is still another important question. The question really, at this point, is that the fact that the land does belong to the state, and we have moved as of a year ago, to adopt certain Amendments, and I think that is the way it ought to go to Third Reading and allow the House to decide one way or the other whether or not this land should be retained or sold. I, at this time, would oppose Amendment #8 and say that 2349 ought to be voted upon on Third Reading the way it came to the House this spring."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I couldn't disagree more with the prior two Speakers regarding...regarding this Bill, and particularly to my colleague from Will County. If he would come to the eastern side of Will County sometime in the part of his constituency that he forgets is there primarily because it is heavily Republican, and politically, I can understand his reluctance to travel to the east side, but if he would come to the east side of the county, he would find on my farm, which abuts a railroad for some half of a mile... if he would come over on Saturday and Sunday, and it is an active railroad; it is the L and N, C and EI, he could help me pick up the garbage and the litter that people who hunt apparagus and tear down my fences every weekend certainly leave there day in and day out, week in and week out. And that is precisely what is happening on the Rock Island Trail at this point in time. It will never be developed. It should never be developed. It is broken in many spots. There is no way to enforce the integrity



of that particular trail for the benefit of the homeowners without enormous fencing expense, without enormous security expense to protect the integrity of the property owners who abut it, to avoid the destruction that the public in the name of hikers, or bikers, or whatever do, and not all of them are certainly, but there are enough of them that are mobile and traveling in our society today that certainly have no regard at all for private property in the country in rural areas. It's fair game. The berry patches, and the asparagus patches, and the mushrooms, it's fair game. Let's go get them out in that field. Let's climb that fence in the middle and break it down and let the cattle out. Now all of you that are from rural downstate areas should recognize that fact. The transportation Subcommittee that held hearings around this state, ... Representative Ropp was absolutely correct. They came to the conclusion through those hearings that were foreheld, that abandoned right-of-ways have no place in the park system in the State of Illinois. Now I have just been told by one of my colleagues who sits very close to me that there was a bike...or a hiking group that was unaware of those hearings and might have testified to the contrary, but they didn't come forward. Maybe there should be more hearings, but public policy, as dictated by that Transportation Subcommittee...or interpreted by it says that these should not be the case. More railroads are going out, the Wabash, and the Rock, and the northern part of the state is going out, and I have a definite conflict of interest <sup>ent</sup> here, Ladies and Gentlemen, and I am telling you that if that C and EI or L and N goes bankrupt, I want to buy that property to keep people off of it, to keep my yard in tact, and to keep the bedsprings, and the litter, and the garbage of humanity off of private property. I think Representative Ropp is absolutely correct. I understand the problem that



Representatives Schraeder and Tuerk have in Peoria County. We don't want to interfere with that. What we would like to do with this Bill, Representative Ropp is correct, is to once and for all say 'Let's get out of these narrow scope activities'. Bike trails can and will be available in the State of Illinois through the Department of Conservation, and Representative VanDuyne, the sale of this property not to give back, and also Representative Leverenz, will more than recompense the state more than..recompense the State for what's been spent by some three to four times by the sale of the property. So I urge you to vote 'yes' on Amendment #8."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

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

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Cook moves the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' and those opposed. The 'ayes' have it, and the previous question has been moved. Representative Ropp to close."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, three quick points in summary. We are very much concerned about park lands and recreational..."

Speaker Taylor: "Representative Ropp, one minute. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yeah, a point of order. I've been trying to find a copy of this Amendment. Has it been distributed?"

Ropp: "Yes, it has."

Bowman: "Can anyone show me a copy of the Amendment? Just wave it in the air."

Ropp: "That..."

Bowman: "Are you the only one that has got one? You got one? Oh, okay."

Ropp: "No, on this particular issue everybody had one this time."

Bowman: "I don't see any over here."

Ropp: "I think it was distributed last year."



Bowman: "Last year?"

Ropp: "That is when the Bill was heard."

Bowman: "May I have a parliamentary inquiry then? Is...don't we have to have the Amendments on our desks, and weren't the desks cleared some time ago?" Where is the Amendment?"

Speaker Taylor: "Representative Bowman, I have been informed by the Clerk that it was reprinted, redistributed again. It has been distributed."

Bowman: "It was?"

Speaker Taylor: "Yes it was."

Bowman: "Okay."

Speaker Taylor: "Representative Ropp to close."

Ropp: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Three real quick points. One is that we all are very much concerned about maintaining existing ongoing state parks. In this particular area of the State of Illinois there is enough park land acres per thousand people that rank that particular portion of the state number three in the nation in terms of acres per thousand people. We are not short...short of recreational facilities in that part of our great state. Secondly, it is my feelings that the state should not continue to condone errors that might have occurred some years ago if we can in due position correct those errors today, and thirdly and finally, it is not my opinion, or it is my opinion that in the wisdom of this great Body of people it was not their intent to sell three existing ongoing state parks which Amendment #5 did do. I urge a favorable Roll Call on this vote."

Speaker Taylor: "On the question of 'Shall Amendment #8 be adopted?'. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think that there are two points worth keeping in mind on this issue. The first is that the land is valuable, and the



most important thing we can do is to preserve prime farmland like this. I hope you will vote to do that. And secondly, give the Gentleman a chance to have his Bill heard. Don't put a disabling Amendment on it that kills it. Give Gordon Ropp a chance to have his idea heard and vote against it on Third Reading if you have to."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I am sure the Schraeder Amendment was put on with the intention of killing this Bill. Now, if it is his intention to kill the Bill, I think that is one thing, but this is the wrong way to do it. Now, number two, I can't think of anybody in their right mind would think that you can police a park 53 miles long and 100 feet wide. And part of the problems in state parks is policing it to save this destruction of state property and certainly you have an obligation to those whose land borders it just as been stated here many, many times. This land can be sold. It can be used for park purposes in the same area, and I am sure we're going to get a lot more for our dollar than we will trying to maintain a park 100 feet wide and 53 miles long. I can't believe anybody would think that is good business."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I think that a park that would reach from VanDuyne to I would be really a fine width for a park, but I can't figure out what he and I would do running along that whole 50... whole 26 mile...or 56 miles or whatever it may be. When you start...when you buy a car, you think of what it is going to cost to maintain it. Whenever you start in to set up a park, you think of the maintenance and what good it is going to do to all the people. Let's sell the ground



and buy a...buy some land that will do the people some good."

Speaker Taylor: "On the question there are 41...The Gentleman from Will, Representative VanDuynes."

VanDuynes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If my cynical ex-friends over there would pay attention to what I said, you know they wouldn't be rambling on here profusely or verbosely as they do. I do not profess to keep this as a park. I said it a million times. I told Representative Ropp this. I just said do not sell it. Give it back, lease it,...some way shape or form to these people who are adjacent to this 26½ miles of right-of-away. Now..if Representative Ropp is serious about this, all he's got to do is file a Bill to have the Department of whatever... Lease this property to these people, and let them have and hold the state harmless for increments of 10, 20, 30, 50 years, whatever. The state would be happy. It wouldn't cost them any money, and I...I believe the adjacent property owners would even be happier and there would be no more bedsprings on the property when the people were using it on the lease...one dollar lease from the state then when...than is they paid \$3,000 an acre. And I hope to hell that Jack Davis and the other Representatives over there get this straight at least once."

Speaker Taylor: "On this question there's 49 'yes', and 94 voting 'no'. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 50 'yes', 94 voting 'no'...He's within his rights. Poll the absentees... No, that would be dilatory, Representative Ropp, because you could not make...you could not pass with that number...82 votes then, and the House declares the Amendment lost. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Taylor: "Third Reading. House Bills Third Reading Short Debate on page four...House Bill 1828, Representative





Stearney."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1828..."

Speaker Taylor: "Take it out of the record. House Bill 2722, Representative Pouncey...take it out of the record. House Bill 3003, Representative Lechowicz."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3003, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3003 is a work product that we started approximately in December with the Secretary of State's office and the number of used car dealers... The Chicago Auto Trade Association for their expressive desire for state legislation to implement and to compliment the Federal Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act. Basically the Bill requires that the odometer reading must be certified by the seller of the vehicle at the time of sale. The mileage certification must be made on the title transfer. The mileage reading then becomes a permanent part of the vehicle title record in the Secretary of State's office. The Secretary of State has...his intent was to start this program May 1 because of the computerization of the title procedures of the motor vehicles in this state. It is the intent, and it will take approximately three and one half to four years to fully implement this program because that is the number of vehicles...approximately 9,000,000 vehicles in this state, and the turn-over is about that rate. The Bill was heard in Committee. It received unanimous vote of the Committee. It has the support of the Secretary of State's office. It has the support of the Chicago Trade Association, the Automobile Trade Association. I know of no person that is against...no one that is against the Bill. I strongly



recommend your serious consideration on House Bill 3003."

Speaker Taylor: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall House Bill 3003 pass?'. And on that question...will vote 'yes', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? On this question there's 13...Mr. Clerk, will you take the record? On this question there's 142 voting 'yes', nine...three voting 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. With leave of the House we will call only Spring Calendar Bills that expires tomorrow. The...House Bills Third Reading Spring Calendar...House Bill 100, Representative Pierce, out of the record. Out of the record. House Bill... Representative Daniels...The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair. How many times now has the Chair gone through the list of Spring Calendar Bills?"

Speaker Taylor: "I don't have that information available at this point."

Simms: "...Yeah...Is there somewhere that you can...you know, it seems like we have went through it at least ten times. Is there some way that you can request to see what Sponsors want their Bills called, and if not, then maybe...It just seems like we're going through an effort...like some of the Iranians..."

Speaker Taylor: "Representative Simms, you have been here as long as I, and whenever we have done that and when we ask leave, Representative Skinner has always objected. So I am going to continue on the Spring Calendar. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move that we suspend the appropriate rule to overcome the objection which has been raised. It is my understanding that with 107 votes of the Members of this House, we could overrule that objection. Those of us who have Bills on here that we would like to back up for Amendment



and call would like to have an opportunity to do that. On the other hand, we don't want to put other people in jeopardy who prefer to do otherwise, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I move that we suspend the appropriate rule and make this a...program...or this approach possible."

Speaker Taylor: "His motion is to suspend the order of call... order of call rule that requires 107 votes. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of Representative Hoffman's motion to suspend the order of call and go to those Bills that the Sponsors have submitted to the Chair, those Bills that the Sponsors would like to have called that are going to die on the Calendar by tomorrow night unless they are called. If we stay on Short Debate or if we continue to go down the Calendar as we have, we are going to find that there are a lot of Sponsors who do not wish to have those Bills called. So for that reason, I would second the motion made by Representative Hoffman to suspend the appropriate rule and take the Bills that have been presented to the Chair."

Speaker Taylor: "The question is 'Shall the...Representative Hoffman's motion to suspend the order of call rule pass?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Deuster...Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On that motion there are 133 voting 'yes', five voting 'nay', and the motion passed. What purpose...Representative Deuster, what purpose do you rise for?"

Deuster: "Yes, could I ask the Chair...the Chair a question? It is my understanding now that we have adopted that suspension of the rules, that those Members who are here who want to have a Bill called can go up, can put their name on a list, and then instead of dilly-dallying around calling Bills, taking them out of the record, we're going to proceed right down, have a little action, consider



Bills, and those Members that don't think they got the votes, don't want them called, will not go up to the Chair. Is that correct?"

Speaker Taylor: "That is correct."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Taylor: "That is correct. Re...Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I am assuming that the Speaker is going to be fair, but I do think it will be helpful if the Clerk would run off some type of a list so that we can have some idea what the list is you have...so that we can predict when something is going to come up rather than it coming up seemingly at random. Would that be possible?"

Speaker Taylor: "That will be possible, Representative Skinner, but at this point we are going from the list that we already compiled from yesterday, and..."

Skinner: "Well, that is fine, but it would be nice if the Speaker would ask the Clerk just to Xerox one up."

Speaker Taylor: "First Bill, House Bill 1800, Representative O'Brien."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1800, a Bill for an Act to amend a<sup>n</sup> Act relating to alcoholic liquor, Third Reading of the Bill."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1800 is a Bill that will give the Chicago park district commissioners the authority to permit the sale of alcoholic beverages on park district property. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Chicago has many attributes and among these attributes are...that we have one of the most beautiful lake fronts in the world, and presently, if you would like to go to dinner and enjoy the lake front, you cannot do that in a nice setting with your family, and you will have to belong to a private club or a yacht club in order to have dinner or a corned beef sandwich and a beer. The push behind this Bill is to develop a couple of first class restaurants



along Chicago's lake front that would be open to the general public for their use. The park district cannot get any individuals that are in the restaurant business such as the Let Us Entertain You group that operates the Pump Room, Carson-Pirie-Scott, Stauffers, etcetra, to invest in a lease along the front because it is not feasible nor is it economical for them without the provision to sell alcohol in a first class restaurant. Many of you will be traveling to New York, and you will be going through Central Park where they have one of the finer restaurants called Tavern on the Green. We are interested in establishing something like that along the north side of Lincoln Park in the City of Chicago, and also Representative Currie has a tremendous amount of interest from her constituents for the establishment of a first class facility at South Shore Country Club. This Bill came out of Committee with a vote of ten to one. This Bill has been supported by Channel 5. It has been supported by Friends of the Park which is a citizens watchdog group which looks over our parks in the Chicago park district. It has been also supported by many small community organizations such as the Lincoln Park Community Organization. I would answer any questions that you may have and ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Taylor: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar."

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

Speaker Taylor: "He indicates that he will."

Mahar: "Would these licenses, if this Bill were passed...would the licenses be issued by the City of Chicago or would they be issued by the park district?"

O'Brien: "The park district will issue the licenses to the individuals that will operate, and they will do it on a single basis."

Mahar: "How many licenses would they be allowed to issue?"



O'Brien: "Well, I think that the Bill somewhat is limited because it indicates that it has to be served...if you'll check on line 24 of, I believe, page one, any building located on. Right now the only push behind this Bill from the media in the City of Chicago in the newspapers, in the editorials is for the establishment of a first class restaurant on the north side and on the south side at South Shore Country Clubs, so we presume possible two locations on the north side of Chicago... or one on the north and one on the south side."

Mahar: "Well then, would we be...establish another liquor commissioner as the Park Board President will become a liquor commissioner as the Mayor and the County Board Presidents are?"

O'Brien: "No...no. Representative Mahar, I am sure that you are aware that there have been many exemptions granted to municipalities, and we have given this permission to serve alcoholic beverages at certain airports, at universitie faculty centers, at other recreational centers, at other park districts throughout the State of Illinois, also at the museums in public parks in the city of Chicago and throughout the State of Illinois. It is nothing that is new. We would like to have the opportunity, and the people in the City of Chicago would like to have the opportunity...the general public to attend a nice restaurant on the lake front and enjoy it all year around."

Mahar: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Taylor: "Proceed."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that we are creating something here that we haven't normally done in the past. Liquor licenses have been controlled under the functions of the local liquor commissioner. Liquor commissioners are the presidents and mayors of cities and villages, and liquor commissioners are also the presidents of county boards. When you establish something like this, you are getting into the area of..."



of...numbers of license to be allowed, the types of licenses to be allowed, the insurance required, the policing and all of that type of things which has been a function of municipalities. It seems to me that we are getting away from this particular aspect. In addition to that, the City of Chicago issues many many licenses for liquor. They charge the private enterprise a sizable fee for those licenses, and it is part of their business to get licenses to bring the private enterprise in and to make some money...make some profit. Here you have a public entity, the park district, competing with the other fine restaurants in Chicago, and it seems to me that this would be not the proper type of thing, and we ought to oppose it."

Speaker Taylor: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield to a couple of questions?"

Speaker Taylor: "He indicates that he will."

Leverenz: "Representative, is this supported by two other groups, one being the park commissioner. Do they support this?"

O'Brien: "Yes, the park commissioners do support it. As you are aware, the park district is in a state of transition, and there are several new park commissioner, but they are in favor of it, and it has some popular support amongst local groups throughout the City of Chicago. I might also add that they will have to meet all of the rules and regulations and insurance claims and so forth, and will be under the jurisdiction of the Licensing Commission for the liquor commissioner of the City of Chicago in addition to getting permission from the park district to have such a facility."

Leverenz: "Alright, the other group I had in mind would be Friends of the Chicago Bears. Do they support this?"

O'Brien: "Well, if it was...if at a public hearing of the Chicago Park District Commissioners that was sentiment in favor



of serving beer at the Bears games, the park commissioners could set this up, and they could serve beer at the Bears' game."

Leverenz: "So that you wouldn't have to bring in your coolers and...that would be included here. We could now purchase a beer and an Oscar Mayer wiener at the Bears' game. Is that correct? ...or maybe that's not kosher."

O'Brien: "Representative Leverenz, you are correct. We are not for promiscuous drinking in the park. This Bill will not prohibit the sale of beer at the beaches. It will not permit the sale of beer at field parks. It will not permit the sale of beer in the baseball diamonds, etcetera, etcetera. Each and every specific instance and permission will be granted in each and every specific instance by the park's commissioner. It will have to be in a facility. If the park commissioners deem that they will take one restaurant on the north side and one on the south side of Chicago, so be it. Also, I am sure the possibility would exist that Soldiers' Field someday could become something of a...something like we have in...Busch Stadium down in St. Louis where they have the Stadium Club down there."

Leverenz: "All of that is to say that you...under your legislation, you can serve, or it is included to provide beer at the Bears games."

O'Brien: "If the park commissioners vote it so."

Leverenz: "And did you say it would include the beaches because there is a beach house there?"

O'Brien: "No."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Taylor: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I am a Cosponsor of this legislation, and my interest in it came out of a group concerned about the revitalization and rehabilitation of an elegant old country club building on the south side of Chicago. That used to belong to priv-





ate individuals to a private country club group after a good deal of work on behalf...by the community. The Chicago Park District bought the facility and has agreed to restore it to its former glory. One of our hopes is that we might be able to see the old elegant dining room which overlooks Lake Michigan restored so that the people of the south shore communities, all the people, can use that facility, can have access to it. What this Bill would do would be to give the Park District Board permission to hold hearings and if appropriate, let a contract so that a restaurateur of some quality might be interested in coming into that building. It also, as Representative O'Brien said, would mean the same thing could happen at some of the park district facilities on the north side. In no way does this Bill give blanket permission to have beer at the beaches on the grasses and the lawns of the Chicago Park District. Rather, it is restricted to within building sale and consumption, that is to say no take out service, and it is restricted so that the Chicago Park District Board would hold hearings, would make individual site decisions. Right now, any park district that wants an exemption for a specific location has to come to the Illinois General Assembly for each and every one of those exemptions. In the past, of course, we have granted very many. For adequate planning for the Chicago Park District, for long term planning, it makes much better sense to give this kind of an exemption which does not encourage wanton, casual drinking all over park district property but only within single locations after a public hearing is held by the Chicago Park District. On that basis, I ask your support for this legislation."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted some clarifi-



cation on the line of...of questioning of Representative Mahar as it started. Let's see, who is to actually issue the liquor license? I mean, I understand that the Park Board says that we have someone who would like to lease this. Who is to issue the license on that?"

O'Brien: "The Liquor Commissioner for the City of Chicago will issue the liquor license."

Williams: "Okay, in other words, that remains the same. It does not take that authority away from the Mayor."

O'Brien: "That is correct."

Williams: "Thank you."

Speaker Taylor: "Any further discussion? Representative O'Brien to close. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of House Bill 1800. If you remember last year, Representative Kelly had a similar Bill that was addressing some of the suburban park districts and other park districts which have big facilities which could not cater events because they could not draw the necessary groups to them. That was supported by many of us on this side of the aisle who felt that we ought to do it. There is no difference there...here than there was there. This measure is a good measure and should be supported by all of us in the House, and I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Brien to close."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. I appreciate the opportunity to have the Bill heard on the House floor clearly. I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call on this because it would give us the opportunity in Chicago to establish a couple of nice restaurants along the lakefront so the families from the community can enjoy it without having to belong to a private club."

Speaker Taylor: "The question is 'Shall House Bill 1800 pass?'"



All in favor signify by voting 'yes', and opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "I rise to vote 'no' on this Bill because the...of the fact that they haven't taken the press box out here and put in a bar so the Members of the House can drink. We voted to put beer and liquor in about every place else in the state."

Speaker Taylor: "Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 116 voting 'yes', 16 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Brummer. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, could Representative Robbins have leave to be recorded as voting 'no'? He apparently forgot to punch the button."

Speaker Taylor: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Wyvetter Younge, on House Bill 703."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 703, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Housing Development Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Taylor: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 703 would provide that the Illinois Housing Development Authority shall establish a demonstration project in East St. Louis, Illinois to develop new and better techniques and methods for increasing the quality and supply of housing for low and moderate income people. Right now in the Illinois Housing Development Authority's statutes is the ability to do research and to look into new and better methods of building housing. Right now the Illinois Housing Development Authority is not developing any housing downstate and in East St. Louis. There is a need for some 4,000 new units of housing. I had asked in previous Sessions that the General Assembly pass a Bill



to put a branch in East St. Louis. I am not requesting that. I am requesting only that the only way that housing can be built...be effectuated through the Illinois Housing Development Authority demonstrating competence in developing the techniques needed to put housing where it is badly needed, and I ask for your approval of this matter."

Speaker Taylor: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall House Bill 703 pass?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', and opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"

Younge: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Taylor: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "May I explain my vote?"

Speaker Taylor: "Proceed."

Younge: "Poor housing has both psychological and physiological effect on peoples' health. We have in the East St. Louis are, a large number of children who are being deprived of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness because they are in uninhabitable bad housing. The reason why the Illinois Housing Development Authority has not come into East St. Louis and helped with this housing situation is that it says that there is no public... there is no developers there to request it. It says... IHDA has the responsibility to build housing. I think that we ought to give it the responsibility to demonstrate that it is trying to help those areas where it is not now participating. And therefore, I ask that you favorably consider this Bill which only requests and requires IHDA to demonstrate how it will build houses in East St. Louis, and I ask for your favorable support of this matter."

Speaker Taylor: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 68 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. House Bill



1192, Representative Sandquist."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1192, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Cannabis Control Act and the Illinois Vehicle Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Taylor: "Representative is next...on deck. Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill that does amend the Cannabis Control Act, but I want to tell you now, it is not a Bill to legalize the use of marijuana. It is not a Bill to decriminalize the use of marijuana, but what it is, is something to make it more responsible and for us here sitting in this Body to take our heads out and to use...show some common sense. Now each and every one of us, or I should say most of us, from time to time might smoke a cigarette or might...or might take something to drink. Neither one of these are good for you, and I'm not saying that the use of marijuana is good for you. What...all I'm saying is this is a Bill that reduces the penalties to make it more realistic so the youth of our country and the youth of our state can have some respect for our law. I would just like to read from a...from a Tribune editorial of just within the last month. It talks about the dangers of marijuana, and I'm not saying there are not dangers in marijuana, but one of the things it does say, 'It is dangerous enough so that it should not be legalized, but overly harsh legal penalties for possession of small amounts should be eliminated.' And that is all that this Bill does. It reduces the penalties for the...for the under 30 grams to have just a...a...it is a crime, but it is a...can be paid with a fine rather than a jail sentence. It also reduces the next step for the use of marijuana, but in no way does it legalize it, and in no way does it decriminalize it. But I think that this is something, the time has come that Illinois should get



along with the other states that have made a more realistic use of the penalties involved, and that is what we are talking about here so that our people can have a respect for the laws, so that our law officials can really carry out to get correct penalties and not be bogged down with the way our statute is at this time, and therefore I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Taylor: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you. Members of the House, I think you want to pay attention to this Bill. It is a Bill that we soundly defeated, I believe, either last year or the term before, and it is an attempt to decriminalize the possession of small amounts of marijuana. Now, the justification for this is that everybody is doing it, that it is very common, and for very small amounts of marijuana we really shouldn't saddle an individual with a criminal record. Well, if you really want to know the truth, we don't now saddle an individual with a criminal record for possession of a very small amount of marijuana. About eight or nine years ago we passed the Cannabis Control Act, what we did was provide for judicial discretion in effect to decriminalize possession of marijuana. Thus, if an individual who maybe is in trouble for the first time or is...only has a small amount of marijuana for whatever reason, we permitted the judge to sentence this person or provide a... whatever penalty the judge saw fit, but...if he behaved himself within a period of time, then this...his conviction would be expunged. Now the fact of the matter is, if you check, all people who are arrested and are convicted of having possession of small amounts of marijuana, this is an incidental offense where a person has been caught with...doing something else far more serious, and it is an ancillary type of offense. People are just not charged criminally with small...possession



of small amounts of marijuana. However, I think that under certain circumstances, for example, a few years ago when the engineer of an L train drove the train off of the tracks, they found...he was convicted also of possession of marijuana. Now that is a very serious incident.. I don't think we ought to pass this Bill. It is a radical departure of what we've been doing. It isn't needed, and I urge an 'no' vote."

Speaker Taylor: "For what purpose does Representative Darrow arise?"

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I note in the files there is a motion filed by Representative Schisler to strike the enacting clause. I believe that would be in order at this time and take precedence. I don't know if Representative Schisler wishes to withdraw that motion or proceed with it, but I think it should be disposed of prior to the vote."

Speaker Taylor: "Does Representative Schisler wish to persist in his motion?"

Schisler: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw the motion."

Speaker Taylor: "He wishes to withdraw his motion. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Years ago I used to listen to a fellow named Jack 'Igan'...used to speak from the Chez Paris at a night show. He used to go on all night, and many times I heard him talking with drug addicts and what have you and he always maintained that anybody that ever... got on drugs never completely cured himself. And as far as I'm concerned, I ain't for lessening the fine or anything for any of these guys that indulge in participating in drugs. I want to drop the roof on them as far as I'm concerned. That's all. I'm strictly against this Bill."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."



Deuster: "If the Sponsor would yield for a question."

Speaker Taylor: "He indicates that he will."

Deuster: "Representative Sandquist, recently I saw a reprint of a Reader's Digest article that...and it may have come to your attention, too, and it was a summary of some of the medical studies of the use of marijuana. And although I don't have the study in front of me, the result was the use of marijuana did contribute to brain damage, and it also was harmful to the sexual and reproductive organs of the human body. And I wanted to ask you whether you were familiar with this scientific body of information or whether you have had time to analyze it, or whether you have any information as Sponsor of whether the use of marijuana is harmful or harmless since it would seem to me that this legislation would be inclined to encourage or accomodate the greater use of marijuana."

Speaker Taylor: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Representative Deuster, I am glad you asked that because sure, I've seen this evidence, and I know that it is mixed up, and I am telling you that marijuana is not good for you to use. If...if you can avoid having it, that is fine. The same way, I can show you the same evidence, cigarettes are not good for you, and the same way that drinking liquor is not good for you either. What we're talking about here is an individual's right to make that decision, and I am saying this. One block from where I live in the City of Chicago, there is a place on Clark Street where they had the St. Valentine's Day Mas'sacre because we tried to do something to stop people as far as prohibition was concerned. You cannot rule everybody's morals. And I'm not saying this is good for you, but let's make it realistic for people, and let's let people know what we are talking about. Let's educate them to what's bad, but not have these bad penalties. But I know about your facts."





Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff."

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

Speaker Taylor: "The question is 'Shall the previous question be moved?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question is raised. Representative Sandquist to close."

Sandquist: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just want you to consider what you are doing here, and I wanted to say this that when Representative Leinenweber talks about the Bill, sure we had it here two years ago. It is the same Bill. It is the same thing that was sponsored by the Bar Association at that time. It got 79 votes at that time, so it wasn't overwhelmingly defeated. Let's show we've for a little sense and a little education. Let's put this over so that people can have respect for the laws. Thank you."

Speaker Taylor: "The question is 'Shall House Bill 1192 pass?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On that question there are 28 voting 'yes', and 124 voting 'no', and...House Bill 1192 failed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Meyer. What..."

Meyer: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wish to announce that we have a new winner of the 1980 'Ryan B. Drought' traveling award, Representative Roy Sandquist, who broke...I don't think he broke...well, it is the 1980 mark."

Speaker Taylor: "House Bill 1387. Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, my name was used, so I want personal consideration. I just want all of you to know that I've got some other Bills coming up, and I don't want to win any awards on those."

Speaker Taylor: "House Bill 1387, Representative Pullen."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1387, a Bill for an Act to amend and



and renumber, add, and repeal various Sections of the Inheritance and Transfer Tax Law, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Taylor: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill as it was originally introduced would repeal the state inheritance tax. There was an Amendment adopted which changes it somewhat so that now it repeals the base state inheritance tax, but it would leave in place what is called the estate pick up tax which equals the maximum credit allowable on the federal estate tax. The basic Bill, however, still repeals the state inheritance tax which is certainly the most foolish tax that this state assesses against people. It is a cruel tax. It is unfair. It hits people when they are in their darkest hours and should not have to be harassed by government. When you think about the principle behind the state inheritance tax, if you can call it a principle, what it really says is that government should be allowed to feed on the savings and investments people have worked all their lives to build so their families can be assured a financially comfortable future. I think that is wrong. The state inheritance tax also is a double tax, and sometimes even a multiple tax because the deceased has already paid tax on the earnings that he has managed to save, and then the state comes along when he is gone and can no longer protest and taxes what is left after already siphoning off so much while you are alive. The state inheritance tax is one of these causes of the loss of family farms and of family businesses. It is cruel not only to the individuals, but to society. We lose so much by the effects of the state inheritance tax. The effect of repealing the inheritance tax if passing this Bill would be to leave some 70 to 75,000,000 dollars in the hands of the taxpayers where it belongs. And that is only about a



half of a percent of the state budget, Ladies and Gentlemen, but it would mean so much to those people who have to pay the tax. And you know, it even effects people who don't have to pay the tax. The inheritance tax affects absolutely everyone, because it is this law that requires that safety deposit boxes and checking and saving accounts have to be frozen at time of death so that when a widow most needs to be assured of her possessions, she cannot get at them. That is cruel. It is wrong, and if we pass this, it will be unnecessary. The inheritance tax 'saps' away capital that if it were invested in savings instead of being paid to the state, would be able to create jobs, and that is something we should all be concerned about, Ladies and Gentlemen. In fact, it is estimated that the 'seed' money required for one new job in the private sector is \$20,000. At that rate, this Bill would produce 3,750 new jobs. And for every one of those jobs, there would be an additional one and one half new industrial jobs created and three-fourths of a new retail job created. So that the net of fact would be to produce over 12,000 new jobs in the State of Illinois if we elect this capital in the private hands where it belongs instead of taking it for government. Virginia and Oregon have repealed their state inheritance taxes in the past couple of years, and Missouri is in the process right now of repealing theirs. The Taxpayers' Federation of Illinois has endorsed this Bill, and I have here, Ladies and Gentlemen, the signatures of over 13,000 people from the State of Illinois urging this House to repeal the state inheritance tax by enacting this Bill. They are not people from my district. They are people from your districts. They are from all over this state. These petitions were not circulated by the Taxpayers' Federation, by Pat Quinn, by Jim 'Toben', or by anybody else, but by me, by my Cosponsors of whom



there are many sitting here this evening, and by the little people who went out into their neighborhoods to sell this message. I urge favorable consideration of this terrific Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Taylor: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Adams Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ms. Pullen has a great Bill here. Actually, as most of you know, if you're practicing law, especially the lawyers, the people end up really paying this inheritance tax 'that at least can afford the middle class', and the middle class can't figure out the intricacies of how to avoid inheritance tax through marital trusts and the other devices that those of us that are in state practices use. So really what this... what you can really do with this Bill if you pass it, if it becomes law is it really is a savings for the middle class plus the double taxation factors that Penny talked about. So I believe if you want to help the middle class, the family farmers, that you will support this piece of legislation. Pass it."

Speaker Taylor: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Swanstrom."

Swanstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in support of House Bill 1387. The inheritance tax is an unfair tax. It is an unfair tax to those who are least able to pay it. The tax is unfair because it essentially taxes income twice. We pay income taxes on our earnings over the years, and then our heirs pay the inheritance tax on any money we have managed to save or put away. We should end this double taxation. The people of this great state are interested in this legislation. I believe it is time we abolish the inheritance tax, and I would respectfully urge you to vote 'yes' on House Bill 1387."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative John



Dunn."

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

Speaker Taylor: "On the question, all in favor of the previous question signify by voting 'aye', 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Pullen to close."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a great many letters seeking this Bill which I am not going to read to you because there seems to be such good reception. But I do want to read one sentence, a one sentence letter which I think sums up what I am trying to get across. It says, 'Dear Representative Pullen, We do not need the inheritance tax. Thank you.'"

Speaker Taylor: "The question is 'Shall House Bill 1387 pass?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf to explain his vote."

Wolf: "I just want...maybe the Sponsor could answer the question by way of explanation. I was just wondering what the exemptions were now. How much is the surviving spouse? How much is each surviving child, nephews, and nieces exempt under this inheritance tax now?"

Speaker Taylor: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I...I just have to stand up and say something about this. No, I don't have...I'm a lawyer. I represent estates, but I think when the people of the State of Illinois sent us down here for tax relief they weren't talking about tax relief where there is a \$40,000 exemption. They were talking about tax relief on sales tax, on food and drugs, that everybody pays. Ladies and Gentlemen, I prac...practiced law for 12 years now, and I don't think there are as many lawyers that do more than 10 or 20 estates a year. That is a thriving practice. If I...if I had 20 estates, I wouldn't be down here. And quite frankly, I



don't know the number of inheritance taxpayers in the State of Illinois, but I bet that there are less than 5,000. I vote 'no'."

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

Bowman: "Yeah, I don't know how we can possibly throw away \$115,000,000 of state revenue like this for a number of taxpayers like Representative Meyers says, that it is so small that they could not fit in a phone booth, certainly sit in the rotunda downstairs. This is \$115,000,000 that we could use for other kinds of tax relief like tax relief on food and medicine, like circuit breakers, benefits, you know, even the Governor's ten dollar give away makes a lot more sense than this. At least everybody benefits a little bit from that. And I don't know how you can say that the rich don't pay it. The McAurther estate is...is going to be a substantial benefit to the State of Illinois. The rich pay inheritance taxes. This is tax relief for the rich, Ladies and Gentlemen, and it is tax relief that we don't need."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am afraid that I suddenly have a conflict of interest in this. I am rather doubtful that I would have dinner with my children if this Bill passed, but I think I will have to vote my conscience and exchange plates with them when we have dinner in the future."

Speaker Taylor: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, rise...I really can't believe this kind of tax relief we're voting here. When you're going back to your people, and you're going to give them \$115,000,000 in tax relief, it's not from...not from... from the middle income people. These are really the rich people. The Wrigley's, look what they paid in the 'last'. That's where this tax comes, and the kind of thing you



think you're saving. The real tax comes from the federal estate tax. So the middle income people are not really getting that much involved. So I think that this kind of relief is a terrible thing that we're foisting upon...on the people."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Marion (sic), Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to clarify a comment that has been mentioned at least twice on the floor now that this was going to cost \$112...or \$115,000,000. With the adding of the Amendment to the Bill, it reduces it by one-third the cost. We're talking about \$70,000,000 instead of \$115,000,000. This is a ghoulish tax. It is double taxation. Alone in my district, the 59th District, we have received...or I have, and I am assuming my colleagues have too, more than 5,000 inquiries or letters urging me to support the repeal of the inheritance tax. I think we are making a drastic mistake, Mr. Speaker, if we don't support this. Missouri and other states are already taking action to repeal the inheritance tax, and it is a ghoulish tax. You work all your life. You pay taxes all your life, state, federal, and...income taxes, federal income taxes, sales taxes, and then when you die your family has to pay a tax because you died. You're dead, and that's unfair, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask for a favorable vote. Let's pass this Bill and get it out to the Governor."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have to share with Representative Sandquist some concern for this Bill. It is no secret that the people who would benefit from this Bill are those who die without benefit of a marital deduction and have estates in excess of \$700,000. Most of us work our whole lives and not accumulate \$700,000



legally. The essence of this tax is to prohibit the passing of wealth from generation to generation, and that was decided by...individuals in Congress. I think that the Governor is going to send this Bill right back to us, and rightfully he should. This is not tax relief, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is an indirect subsidy to the rich, the affluent of our society. And I don't think that if you looked at this legislation carefully and you analyzed it, that you could, in good conscience, go back to your constituents most of whom are middle and lower income persons and justify this kind of throw away during these severe economic times. This Bill may look good politically for some people, but it is not tax relief. This is an indirect subsidy to the rich. And I don't think that the Governor is going to give this Bill one thought, and rightfully he should send it right back to us."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't believe that anyone spoke against this Bill in debate, and not until it got an explanation of votes did Ted Meyer rise and...to speak against the Bill. I think when he did kind of a hush fell over the floor. I think everyone was kind of hoping that this would pass without anybody really saying anything because you have to really admit now that you look up there at all those 'yes' votes that this is really embarrassing. It really is embarrassing to everyone sitting on this floor that we debated and debated and debated tax relief last year and said we couldn't give the senior citizens an extra penny off of food and medicine, and somebody stands up and says 'Well, this is really not \$110,000,000. It is only \$70,000,000.' Now that is really embarrassing to go back and say, 'Yes we can. We can afford tax relief. We can't afford it for the poor. We can't afford it for





the middle class, but we can afford tax relief for the rich.' It is embarrassing. It is disgraceful."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from...the Lady from Sangamon, Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't know how you can say this is for the rich. We've got a deduction now \$40,000. Most of the poor people and the middle class...lower middle class people I know in this county have worked and scraped and finally bought a house, and it is worse now because of our inflated prices. Maybe it was only worth \$15,000, now it is put on the books for \$40,000. So when the one spouse dies, what happens? The other spouse can't live in that house. The children can't live there. They've got to go sell the house and go off some other place. What I'm hoping this does is help those people who have worked all their lives to get something to keep it within the family. And talking about farmers, I wish you'd come out there if you think we're so darned rich. We have a couple of hunks of pieces of equipment out there and some land. Well, I want you to live on a piece of equipment. I would like to see you eat it. I would like to see you wear it. And then your farm passes, and guess what. The nice little wife who has worked all of her life out there, she can just get out of that farm now because she has to sell it to pay the inheritance tax on these inflated prices. If this is a Bill for the rich, you are crazy. This is a Bill for the people like you and me and a lot less of us."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am not going to repeat the sentiments echoed by some previous speakers in regards to the... who this Bill will help. I'll tell you who it is going to hurt, and that is those people who depend on state



services. If we continue to reduce the resources of the state, you're not going to have enough money for schools. You're not going to have enough money for mental health. You're not going to have enough money for other kinds of human services. We have got to look at both ends. We can't have it both ways. We cannot vote for all the tax relief that we want to and provide all the services. We have a responsibility to make some of those decisions. It is wrong and unfair for us to put this entire burden onto the Governor. And for that reason, I vote 'no'."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, if a Member of the other side of the aisle hadn't been quite as strident I wouldn't be standing up here today. I would like to point out that there is an increasing tendency for farmland to go into the hands of corporations, and do you know why that's happening? It is happening because corporations don't die. If corporations don't die, they don't pay inheritance tax. Family farmers do die, and when they die, they probably are going to have to sell out to a corporation. Now if you want corporate America to own all the farm land in the United States, or at least in Illinois, I think this would be a good Bill to defeat. If you think the family farmer has been a productive member of society, and that the competition...or let's say the control of production should not be concentrated...I think the inheritance tax ought to be abolished, and that is why I am voting 'yes'."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there has been a lot of talk here about farmers, but if you look at where the inheritance tax is paid, most of the inheritance tax that comes in on this state comes in from Cook County, and Lake County, and DuPage County, and



those wealthy counties, not the downstate farm communities. How many farms do you have up there? The inheritance tax, and there has been a lot of talk about double taxation, there is an awful lot of income that is never taxed. All of those people who buy municipal bonds, they are not taxed. They don't pay any tax on that income. The only time that income is ever taxed is on an inheritance tax. I think that this is a tax...this is the last tax that we should be removing. If we have a problem with family farms, we should address that as a separate issue and a particular issue and not something to be handled by eliminating the tax all together because this is a tax that falls primarily on the wealthy, the very wealthy in our state, and this is the last tax that we should be giving tax relief on."

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

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker, I just had a call from my wife. She told me to vote 'yes', so I'll change."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative John Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, all of this rhetoric has changed about four or five votes. Would you please take the record so we can go on to another Bill?"

Speaker Taylor: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', 36 voting 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 748, Representative Marovitz. And House Bill 524 is next on deck, Representative Huff."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 748, a Bill for an Act..."

Speaker Taylor: "One moment, Mr. Clerk. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Is my light working up there, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Taylor: "It is on, but it's not flashing, Sir."

Ewing: "Maybe we ought to have it fixed."



Speaker Taylor: "We will."

Ewing: "Thank you."

Speaker Taylor: "748, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 748, a Bill for an Act to amend the  
Public Utilities Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Taylor: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and  
Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 748 is a Bill which  
would say that if you make every attempt to check the  
phone book for a number of an individual, cannot find  
it in the phone book, then call directory assistance  
after checking, and upon calling directory assistance, are  
told that the number is unlisted, and they cannot give  
it to you. In that circumstance, the call to directory  
assistance would not be charged against your eight or  
five free directory assistance phone calls. Originally,  
this Bill had substantially more in it, and at the  
request of several Members of the Utility Committee  
who asked me to remove the most objectional parts of the  
Bill, I did so, and still the objection from the Illinois  
Bell remains. I think the Bill now is very reasonable.  
It merely says if you don't get any service, you are not  
going to face a charge. May I analogize this to someone  
who goes into a clothing store and looks for a shirt  
and finds that his size is out. Upon leaving the store  
he doesn't have to pay a dollar or five dollars even  
though he used up the time of somebody who is the  
employee in the store. Or somebody who goes to find...  
get a quart of milk but finds that the store is out  
of milk and doesn't have to pay for the milk upon leaving  
or for the charge of an employee upon leaving. In this  
particular case, an individual who makes every reasonable  
effort to check the phone book without calling directory  
assistance, can't find the number, then calls directory  
assistance, still can't get any...any...any help. In  
that limited circumstance, he would not be charged against



his eight or five free directory assistance calls. I think it is a very reasonable Bill, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on this piece of legislation."

Speaker Taylor: "Is there any discussion? The question is 'Shall House Bill 748 pass?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti."

Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill would end a two year directory assistance charge...plan...trial, because it would increase our directory assistance costs by at least \$6,500,000. This is an unnecessary expenditure in view of the fact that the present trial which includes a calling allowance has proven to be so effective that 90% of their customers, including many senior citizens on fixed incomes are not billed for calls to directory assistance. When the Gentleman says that most of the objectional parts in this Bill have been taken out, it is not really true. We've got a trial system going on now with the Illinois Commerce Commission. Let's find out just what that trial period is going to do before we come up and vote for this Bill. I urge you to defeat this Bill."

Speaker Taylor: "Is there any further discussion? Have all... Representative Sharp."

Sharp: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise to say a few words. The Sponsor was correct in that he did take out some of the objectional parts in here whereas you could get three numbers on one call and three phone books, and so forth, and I think that this Bill was probably the most reasonable Bill dealing with directory assistance that our Committee heard this last Session. We had some Bills that would have prohibited entirely charging for directory assistance. The Committee turned that back because of the...the comments that were made that it would cost those who do not use directory assistance. And so I think as Chairman of the Committee, that we passed out



here probably the most reasonable approach to the concerns that were shown about charging for directory assistance, and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Taylor: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, will you take the record please? On this question there are 111 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I would like to be recorded 'no' on 748 please."

Speaker Taylor: "Record Representative Leverenz 'no'. House Bill 524, Representative Huff on Third Conference Committee report...First Conference Committee report. House Bill 524."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I do...move that we do adopt House Bill 524 which is...recommends the Conference Committee report. This Bill would...exclude automobile windshield glass from any deductible on comprehensive insurance coverage. We are seeing people today delay or completely defer replacing broken or damaged automobile glass because they cannot afford to pay the deductible. When the windshield has a break, crack or chip in the primary vision area frame by the windshield wiper sweep, it is critical from a viewing safety standpoint that the windshield be replaced. Such damage and impaired vision, especially at sunset and sunrise, and rain or snow, or when facing oncoming cars at night."

Speaker Taylor: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from White, Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Conference Committee report tries to resurrect a Bill which has been defeated in this House a number of times. This is the procedure that says that if you want to buy a deductible policy for automobile insurance on glass, that you can't do it in Illinois. It



would require that insurance companies in issuing these policies remove one of the options that you have now which is to buy either full coverage insurance or deductible insurance. This Bill which is introduced at the request of the glass industry says that when you go to buy insurance you can't buy a deductible policy. The House has rejected this matter several times in the past. We rejected the First Conference Committee report, and they went into a Second Con... went back...excuse me, I'm wrong about that. We rejected the Senate Amendment, and this is the First Conference Committee report, and the Conference came back again suggesting that the House accept this Amendment, and I suggest to you that it is a bad idea, and it will only result in increasing automobile insurance premiums for your customer...for your clients at home and your constituents at home, so I would advise a vote against this very bad Bill."

Speaker Taylor: "Any further discussion? Representative Huff to close."

Huff: "Well, I don't know, Mr. Speaker, where the last Speaker is getting his information. In terms of the unit cost, the auto...the automobile windshield deductible is under four dollars. With the exclusion of the automobile deductible, the cost...the unit cost will still be under four dollars. And if...an insurer does not wish to have the...this coverage, let him decide. He can still...he can decide whether he wants the coverage with the deductible or without the deductible. He will pay a very small premium at best. Let me read what the Insurance Department says... The State Insurance Department official comments and a report that the reason for dramatic increase is because people with large deductibles are less likely to repair damage than if they were fully covered by the insurance. I think that what we are attempting to do is to give more



attention to highway public safety than to, as Mr. Shuneman would have you believe, the cost. And the cost in this case is very nominal. With the deductible, I think you're talking about \$3.90...94¢ with...without the deductible you're talking about \$3.97. I think that this is a good Bill and is worthy of our positive consideration."

Speaker Taylor: "The question is 'Shall the First Conference Committee report on House Bill 524 pass?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 64 voting 'yes', 59 voting 'no', and Keane, 'aye'. This report failed. McAuliffe, 'aye'. Not having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. House Bill 2044, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "...Bill 2044 which is jointly sponsored by myself and Representative McClain and supported by the Illinois Department of Public Health. It recognizes that tuberculosis control is necessary, but that a separate tax district may not be needed in all counties. I would state at the outset this is a permissive Bill, not a mandatory Bill. Nothing happens if a local county board doesn't want anything to happen. There are several categories of tuberculosis..."

Speaker Taylor: "Representative Skinner, if you'll let the Clerk read the Bill first..."

Skinner: "Sorry, the light came on, and you know what that means."

Speaker Taylor: "House Bill 12...2044, the Gentleman from... Third Reading."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2044, a Bill for an Act to amend and repeal numerous Acts and parts of Acts, Third Reading of the Bill."

Skinner: "Tuberculosis districts were the first public health





districts in Illinois, and they have served honorably, and I think pretty well achieved the purpose for which they were designed. Tuberculosis sanitariums are being closed and sold all over the state or used for other purposes and out patient care is certainly a reality. Public Health Departments with broader mandates do exist in many parts of the state, but tuberculosis districts are the only public health efforts in other parts of the state. House Bill 2044 attempts to craft a mechanism whereby tuberculosis districts can be merged with County Public Health Departments where such departments exist and be transformed into Public Health Departments where they do not exist. This would be accomplished by a County Board Resolution. Sufficient tax rates would be guaranteed to maintain present tuberculosis services, and we have done that two ways. We either take an average tax rate over the last five years or we take the average tax rate that would have been necessary to raise the money spent over the last five years if no taxes had been levied, as is the case in some counties where there have been illegal suppluses. Where both the TB Board and Public Health Board exist, the Public Health Board would be increased by three members...there just happen to be three members on TB Boards, to make it possible to put all three TB members...TB Board members on the Public Health Board if the County Chairman so desires. The...I think the Bill is a way to...to phase out public health...or phase out tuberculosis districts where they are not needed, but there is production if the County Board doesn't want to phase them out. We need the legislation because...well,...because TB districts have outlived their usefulness basically. It takes a referendum now. We're allowing County Boards to do it by Resolution."

Speaker Taylor: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow."



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

Skinner: "Certainly."

Speaker Taylor: "He indicates that he will."

Darrow: "Would you explain Amendment #5 and the tax limitations provisions of that Amendment?"

Speaker Taylor: "Turn on Representative Skinner's light."

Skinner: "When I talked to the...the Public Health Department people and the local County Public Health Department people, they expressed the desire to have an ability for their tax...taxes to grow, and so I have put this on. It is really not crucial. I would be happy to take it off in the Senate if there are strong objections. It doesn't make much difference one way or the other to me. I thought I was doing them a favor."

Darrow: "You're limiting their taxing power, aren't you?"

Skinner: "Well, we're limiting it very severely by...by leaving it at the five year average of what they would...what they have sent. And this would allow growth. Instead of limiting to that dollar amount, what we are allowing here is growth in direct proportions to the increase in personal income in Illinois."

Darrow: "Do you know if the counties are in favor of this Amendment...this type of limitation?"

Skinner: "I really haven't gotten any feedback one way or the other, Representative."

Darrow: "But..."

Skinner: "Then I talked to...I did talk to the president of the Illinois County Health Department Association or whatever it is called, and I do know that he agreed to it. He thought it was a good thing."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Taylor: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if I understand the impact of this Bill, it is an issue that certainly needs to be supported. As Representative



Skinner said, it not only takes a referendum at the local level now to abolish the district, but that referendum has to pass by an extraordinary Majority. So even if a Majority of the voters vote against retaining a TB tax district, it is sometimes not possible to get the extraordinary Majority to abolish it. I think this is a very good alternative allowing the county to take its own initiative if it wants to do this, and I compliment the Representative for his foresightedness in providing this legislation."

Speaker Taylor: "Any further discussion? Representative Skinner to close."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in 1970 one of the arguments for passing the new Constitution was that we would have fewer tax districts. This has not occurred. We now have more tax districts than we had in 1970. It seems to me that those tax districts who have served honorably and deserve a gold watch in retirement should be eager to abolish and to replace or to...replace or to merge with Public Health Departments in effect. That is what this Bill does. It is an extremely carefully thought out Bill in my opinion. I have been absolutely through the winger with the Illinois Lung Association, and the Illinois Public Health Department, and the local County Health Departments, and the local TB districts. We have everything in here you can imagine including a grandmother clause for the TB nurses. I think it meets virtually everybody's objections, and it does...it does do one thing. It does give the power to the County Board to determine whether a county wide tax district should continue. If the County Board decides that it wants to abolish that tax district, it is mandated to continue the service, but is given the tax rate in order to finance that service. I would ask for your favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Taylor: "~~The question is 'Shall House Bill 2044 pass?'~~"



All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, does this Bill affect Cook County? I don't believe it does, but..."

Skinner: "I think it does, but I think it is totally irrelevant since Cook County is a home rule unit."

Lechowicz: "Alright, okay."

Speaker Taylor: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 118 voting 'yes', three voting 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1239, Representative Cullerton."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1239, a Bill for an Act to amend a Section of the Illinois Income Tax Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Taylor: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this will be the first time this year that we will be able to pass out a significant tax relief Bill. This is a very significant one. The Governor in his message of February 13 indicated that we would...he was recommending that we have a tax relief package that would include...be somewhat short...a little bit short of \$300,000,000. This particular Bill will save people in the State of Illinois somewhere betw... from \$26,000,000 to \$30,000,000. This Bill allows a state income tax deduction for the rental equivalent of property for renters. That being defined as 30% of your gross annual rent. The theory behind this Bill is that homeowners do have a deduction on their state... on their federal income tax for the property taxes that they pay as well as the money that they...the interest they pay on their mortgage. This is to give renters that same type of a break. And as everyone here knows,



there is very few new rental units being built. The few rental units that we have left are...many of them are going condominium and there's many people who just simply because of the market cannot afford to purchase a home, and they are forced to be renters. And this situation is very significant. Senator D'Arco is the Senate Sponsor of this Bill. The Bill actually did pass last June, but we called it back. I would be happy to answer any questions, and I would ask for an affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Taylor: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 1239 pass?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I wish that everybody would push their own button. I don't want to get up and verify the Roll Call. I don't want to delay these proceedings here tonight, but I know there's not 95 people voting on this Bill, and if it remains the same, I am going to ask for a verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Taylor: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 99 voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no'."

Conti: "I am going to persist on the verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Taylor: "Representative Cullerton. Poll of the Absentees." Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Mr. Speaker, would you please vote me 'aye'?"

Speaker Taylor: "Record Representative Stiehl as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I think you ought to get your glasses checked because I was waiving a newspaper and everything at you a while ago trying to get a chance to explain my vote on this."

Speaker Taylor: "It is dark in that corner."



Huskey: "I see. I just was hoping that you weren't getting bad eyes. Actually, this is a very good Bill. I had a Bill in last year similar to this. You know, every rental building gets its tax break. The renter is paying on that building the same as a homeowner's paying the mortgage company, and the renter is certainly deserving of an equal amount of tax break because he is contributing to that building. And in all fairness, this Bill deserves an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Taylor: "Poll the Absentees, Mr. Clerk. Poll the Absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Abramson, Anderson, Bluthardt, Borchers, Davis, Doyle, Ewing, Griesheimer, Henry, Hoxsey, Huff, Johnson, Emil Jones, Katz, Klosak, Leverenz, Margulas,..."

Speaker Taylor: "Representative Margulas...vote 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "McBroom, Molloy, Polk, Pullen, Rigney, Robbins, Ryan, Schlickman, Stearney, Steczo, Swanstrom, Telscer, Totten, VonBoeckman, Walsh, Williamson, Winchester, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Taylor: "Representative Huff, 'aye'. Representative Karpel votes 'no', Representative Pechous votes 'aye'. Representative...Representative Doxle votes 'aye'. Representative...Speaker, 'aye', Representative Peters...Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, change me to 'no' please. 'Aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Taylor: "Change him from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Winchester votes 'no'. Representative Walsh votes 'no'. Representative Campbell votes 'no'. Representative Steczo votes 'aye'. Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "...From 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Taylor: "Change Representative Murphy from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Will you please change me from 'aye' to 'no'?"

Speaker Taylor: "Change Representative Bradley from 'aye' to 'no'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Representative McAuliffe...change from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative



McAuliffe. The count at present is 102 'ayes', and 46 'nos'. Does Representative Conti persist in his verification?"

Conti: "What's the count, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Taylor: "One hundred and two 'ayes', forty-six 'no'."

Conti: "Alright, Mr. Speaker. I am going to put you on notice from here on out on all Bills. I won't persist on this one. There is 102 votes, but I want to make it very clear that any more of this pushing those buttons, I want to know about it. You're going to have a verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Taylor: "Senate Bill 1239 had 102 'aye', 46 'nos', and having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think really at this point maybe we should have a few observations. We have a lot of people standing up in front of us, and they want some relief in their farms and their home towns, and they want to help the farmers, and we grant relief. We have people stand up in front of us, and they say they want to have an exemption or elimination of the inheritance tax, and we eliminate the inheritance tax. We have people stand up, and they say they want to eliminate a portion of the sales tax, and we do that, and then we increase the homestead exemption. Well, if you haven't gotten your calls from the mayors yet, and if the mayors haven't said to you that we are hurting them back home because we are eroding their base and affecting their assessed evaluation, I think you are going to start getting it. And I really think that some of the people in the House ought to start looking at the consequence of their action and the erosion of revenues for this state before they start acting too heavily on tax relief and every single Bill that comes up. And when we look a little more responsibly, I think we can address the issue of tax relief a little



bit better than we've been doing."

Speaker Taylor: "House Bill 447, Representative Reilly. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk." 447."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 447, a Bill for an Act to create the School District Income Tax Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Taylor: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The House is busy tonight. I am not going to take a long time. This Bill is really a very simple concept. It is an enabling Act that allows the taxpayers, if they choose, to do a very major thing about their property taxes. We will hear a lot in this Session about property tax relief. I submit to you that in all honesty, this Bill...this approach is the only real significant property tax relief we can honestly offer the voters. What this says is that if the voters in a school district, I repeat, if the voters in a school district by front door referendum only choose to substitute for part or all of the money they are getting from the property tax and income tax, then they may do so. The Bill further provides that within...within the Bill it provides that every dollar in new revenue that is raised by this tax...by the new tax, must abate the property tax dollar for dollar. There cannot be any tax increase as a result of this even if the voters in the district pass a referendum. All we're saying here is the simple facts of life. School districts collect 70% of the property taxes collected in the state. If you want to do anything about that, you've got to give school districts another way to raise revenue. What we're saying here is really an enabling Act. It says to the people in your school districts, 'If you want, and only if you want, you can choose to substitute a fairer, a more progressive form of taxation that says when you have a good year, when you make the money you pay some tax, in a bad year when you don't make any money, you pay no





tax. This Bill is supported by the chief education groups in the state. It is supported by all the farm groups in the state. It is supported by all of the senior citizen groups in the state. With that kind of backing I would hope it would receive favorable consideration. I would be glad to <sup>an</sup> answer any questions, but again I want to stress the two points that it's got to be driven home. There can be no tax increase as a result of this Bill because every dollar you raise and the new tax must go to lower the existing property tax, and it can be done only by referendum at the local level. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Representative Reilly's Bill. I am a Co...major Cosponsor of 447, and what the Bill does is...the answer to all the studies that have been made the last 15 years by School Problems Commissions...office of the superintendent of public education that the only reform possible in the support of the school...the only revenue reform possible in the support of schools is the use of the state income tax. Now this is a front door approach to allow school districts all over the State of Illinois, there are about 1,400 of them, to say to their constituency their...the property tax is saturated. We don't want to increase any...any more tax on our property, and we were willing to tax ourselves in the support of our schools from our income tax. I think this is the finest, the purest, and the simplest way to go, and I will highly support Representative Reilly on this Bill."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative Reilly, would you yield to a question please?"



Reilly: "Yes."

Stuffle: "Representative Reilly, in reading the synopsis of the Bill, there is an indication that it also amends 18A to the School Code. You made some reference to that, I think. How...in what manner do you adjust for the qualifying rate since you have...obviously would be reducing the property tax rate that...and then operating tax rate that is now used for school aid purposes...in what manner do you adjust for the district that might pass this Amendment?"

Reilly: "Okay, in the...in the Bill as it originally was introduced, we had to make that kind of adjustment, and what we did as it was originally introduced was to...there is just a formula that figured out what the number of dollars your question from the new tax meant in terms of a property tax rate, but we accepted an Amendment in Committee offered by...or suggested by Representative Madigan that makes this dollar for dollar trade off, so now you don't have that problem any more. The property tax levy...the property tax rate, excuse me, would...would remain the same. You would levy it, and you would abate it so that...we now have to make no adjustments in the formula."

Stuffle: "But what is the rate? What do you do with the rate? You've got a specific operating rate for school aid formula purposes now, what happens...you just assume the rate was where it was, or what?"

Reilly: "The rate would be where it was. You'd go ahead and have that rate, but then...then you would abate the property tax. It is fairly common procedure at the local level."

Stuffle: "You'd abate the levy, but the rate would surely change, wouldn't it? You're not going to keep a 218 rate, are you? The way...you've got a 218 rate in a district now, and you...you put this into effect, you're going to keep a 218 rate?"



Reilly: "What? I...I guess I don't understand your question. There is no reason why the rate needs...needs to change. The rate...is applied against the assessed valuation."

Stuffle: "That's right."

Reilly: "...That produces the levy."

Stuffle: "You're not taking the assessed valuation off the roles with this."

Reilly: "No."

Stuffle: "If you keep the assessed valuation where it is... you keep the rate where it was, and you put a new rate on for income tax, I don't..."

Reilly: "The school district is going to raise exactly the same number of dollars with this Bill as they were before."

Stuffle: "My question is still the same. What happens to their qualifications for state aid purposes..."

Reilly: "Nothing."

Stuffle: "Well, I don't see how that could be. If you've got a rate now of \$2.18, for example, in a district, they adopt this income tax formula, whatever percentage it may be, against income, it would seem to me that you'd have to lower the property tax rate if you don't change the assessments, or you would still be producing..."

Reilly: "No, because the procedure would still be the same. You would still apply the same rate against the same assessed valuation and produce the same levy. It is just that them having done that, you would abate the levy by whatever amount you collected in the new tax."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative 'Bell'."

'Bell': "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, will the Sponsor yield?"

Reilly: "Yes."

Speaker Taylor: "He indicates that he will."

'Bell': "Representative Reilly, in my district we have quite a bit of industry, and does this cover corporate income tax also, because they pay a large percentage of



our property tax?"

Reilly: "The problem is that no one has been able to suggest a reasonable way. With corporations you have the problem that they earn money in a lot of places. They aren't just earning it where they live so to speak. So what we do is simply...we're going to lower everybody else's property taxes by whatever amount we collect from them in income tax. What we do with industry...with corporations is just leave the property tax on at whatever rate it currently is."

'Bell': "So the corporations then will pay the property tax residences or the individuals will pay income tax."

Reilly: "That's right. Understand that for no category of taxpayer is...across the categories, the amount that they pay is going to change. The total numbers individuals in a district will pay the same amount they are now. The total number of corporations will pay the same they are now. It merely allows among individuals the choice of having what many would consider a more equitable tax system."

'Bell': "Thank you."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane."

Kane: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Taylor: "He indicates that he will."

Kane: "Who is going to collect this tax?"

Reilly: "The Department of Revenue."

Kane: "And it is only going to be on individual income?"

Reilly: "Yes. Yes."

Kane: "Okay, don't you run into the same problem with individuals though that you do with corporations?"

Reilly: "No, because..."

Kane: "Are you going to tax a person in the school district that he lives in or that he works in?"

Reilly: "Lives in."

Kane: "What happens if you have a...an individual who lives in



the suburbs and gets an income tax on his income and then works in the city, and the city levies a payroll tax...under its home rule powers?"

Reilly: "That's no different from the current problem where the city, if it wants under its home rule power, could levy such a tax, and you would continue to pay property taxes in your school district to support the school district."

Kane: "Okay, but what you would have though is...or what you could have is a question where you have an individual who lives in one school district and works in another. could be paying for two school districts."

Reilly: "No, that is incorrect. The courts are very clear when it comes to individuals and have recognized for a long time, as we do this in the state income tax and the federal income tax. We say that an individual earns income where he lives, and...in terms of support for the school districts, you're just incorrect. This Bill sets up the standard, and this Bill says that we're going to tax income where the individual lives."

Kane: "What about partnerships?"

Reilly: "I'm sorry."

Kane: "What about partnerships?"

Reilly: "They would be taxed...they would remain subject to the property tax."

Kane: "They would be...would partnerships be treated the same as corporations?"

Reilly: "Yes."

Kane: "How about trust in estates?"

Reilly: "The same."

Kane: "How can you abate property taxes for individuals but not for corporations. Doesn't that go against the...the constitutional requirement for equal taxation on property?"

Reilly: "No, we have the authority first of all if we chose to exercise it to, you know, tack it to, categorize, or classify property. We have checked this with a variety



of legal sources who say that we have the authority to do this. The corporations as a class will not be affected. The individuals as a class will not be affected."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Speaker Redmond."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hadn't intended to vote for this measure until I received my real estate property tax bill in DuPage County this morning. I would like to tell you that in 1977 my real estate taxes were \$1,311, in 1978 they were \$1,481, in 1979 they were \$1,533, and the bill that I got today was \$1,750, and that is after the \$3,000 homestead exemption had been deducted, and after the \$1,500 senior citizen exemption had been deducted. A \$400 increase in the last four tax bills, 25% increase, and it seems to me that ever since I been here we've done all sorts of things about what we are going to do to relieve the real estate property taxpayer, and so far, efforts have been rather insignificant and inconsequential. I believe that on behalf of people in my age bracket who I see are going to...are in social security is going to be raised to three hundred and some odd dollars, but it is absolutely mandatory that we figure out some way that we can relieve the real estate taxes. I intend to vote for this measure, and I will vote for it. I am not too sure that it is going to be perfect, but it...finally we may be striking some kind of a blow and give a relief to the real estate taxpayer."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Taylor: "He indicates that he will."

Friedrich: "I find this very confusing, and I suppose everybody else is smart enough to figure out what you're proposing here, but what about an absentee landlord. I own my property or my farm in one school district and live



in another one. My income is in one district,...the other. You certainly can't tax my income if I don't live in your school district."

Reilly: "That's correct."

Friedrich: "So, what about my real estate tax?"

Reilly: "If...that's one of the items that...that people would have to take into account in deciding whether economically it was a sensible thing for their school district to do. The...understand that we're not saying necessarily. It would be up to the voters in the referendum whether they wanted to do away...to raise enough revenue through the new tax to do away with the property tax or just go half and half or however they chose to go. Frankly, I would expect historically that at least for the first few years any school district would choose to do less than abolish the property tax. They would probably perhaps raise half their revenue through this new tax. But the answer is that under the terms of the Bill the absentee landlord would pay no income tax to the extent the property tax is not completely abated which in my guess would be to a considerable extent. The absentee landlord, of course, would continue to pay property tax."

Friedrich: "Well, since...since residence is a matter of intent, I am going to keep my property in the place where you take...get the income tax, and I am going to declare my legal residence over in the other district, and it won't take me very long to figure out how to do that, so I think you are creating a real bucket of worms here that is almost impossible to administer, and the other thing of course is that you're...the one thing about real estate taxes, they are stable, and you can depend one year to the next what you're going to get. If you tie up the income tax, then you're going to have a floating real estate tax because the income tax is going to vary. This year you're going to collect a million



dollars in income tax, the next year you're going to collect nine hundred thousand. You've got to make it up in real estate taxes, so you're real estate taxes are going to be going up and down like a thermometer. I think ...I think this hasn't been very well thought out."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Brackley...Bradley."

Bradley: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I sympathize greatly with the Speaker, and I know that he and I have talked at length about the quadrennial reassessments and one thing and another. This Bill, if it was mandatory that you base wealth on income to determine state aid, that would be a different situation, but you are combining the two of them together, and you leave it up as a...at a referendum, and they can combine both, and that's simply not workable. We have talked about time after for the last few years of asking the Department of Revenue to place on our income tax return a line that would indicate what school district that we were in when we were paying our income tax so that we could make a determination of the wealth of the school district, and then we would be able to use that information in trying to determine a formula that would...that we could pay state aid to the school using income and basing income as wealth to replace basing in... basing real estate as wealth. Now if you want to do that, I could support that, but I don't think that we can support this concept. We...we're not ready for a dualconcept to determine state aid or aid to schools, and I am in sympathy with what you're trying to do, but I just don't think that today that we're ready for this concept in Illinois unless you go all the way and you mandate that wealth is determined by the amount of income that you generate. Mr. Reilly is too close to me now, and I lost that last train of thought that I was going to make one more point on it. I think I'll finish with





that statement that it just is not feasible to do it. I would be in support, and I think we ought to look. The School Problems Commission, I'm sure, in other states have looked at the possibility of determining wealth by income and not by real estate values, and I would suggest that maybe we're not ready for reform to this extent at this time, and I can also suggest to the Members that I can very easily read the...read the headlines tomorrow that the Illinois House adopts new income tax. I certainly don't want to be a part of that, and I would suggest maybe that the School Problems Commission take this up, and we'll take a look at it a little later on, and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor...I wanted to ask him a question, but apparently he's..."

Speaker Taylor: "He indicates that he will."

Mahar: "Yes, Representative Reilly, let's say that we...that you're Bill is signed into law, and there is a referendum to enact an income tax in my district and I am a renter. I understand that the principle is that...for all of the income tax that comes in, we're going to decrease the property taxes by appropriate amounts. Now if I am a renter, and I am going to be paying the income tax, who will get the benefit of the property tax abatement?"

Reilly: "...Obviously the answer you know is directly the landlord who is paying the property tax wealth. So let me...let me expand on that in two ways. First of all, that will reduce the landlords costs and reduce by that extent the upward pressure on rent. Second of all, one of the criticisms all along is that you can have a millionaire who rents who pays no property tax, and one of the fair things about the income tax is that you don't have that obvious injustice."

Mahar: "But you can always have the millionaire who owns the



property too, lots of property the same way who would then get the benefit by the large apartment building that he rents out..."

Reilly: "But if he is a millionaire, he will pay the income tax also."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Slape."

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

Speaker Taylor: "He indicates that he will."

Slape: "Okay. Jim, in the Bill I notice that you try to make an attempt on the education fund to limit the increase in the...or limit the actual income tax and try to balance it out with the property tax that would be decreased. Is that right?"

Reilly: "Yeah."

Slape: "Okay, is there any attempt to keep the county government from expanding in other areas, and the reason I say this is I represent eight counties, and of those eight counties the average tax dollars, 60¢ of it goes to education. What's to keep a county board from saying, 'Okay, we now have this income tax to make up that 60¢ so let's keep that 60¢ and expand our government spending other places.?'"

Reilly: "Well, I'm not sure I understand your question. The county board has no authority to spend the 60¢ or to levy the 60¢. Statutorily, that authority is only given to the school board. Most county boards would be fairly close, a lot closer than you're talking about anyway, to their statutory limit and would have to go to a referendum to go beyond that."

Slape: "Well, what I'm saying is I think right now most county boards in Southern Illinois are contingent (sic) of the fact that the school district is going to levy a rate that is going to be somewhere equivalent to 60¢ out of every dollar going to the education...going to education in their counties, and they are probably holding down on a lot of things and not levying this, you know, as



much they could be. What's to keep the county boards from saying, 'Okay, that 60¢ that we've known has been there, and we've been kind of working around is now being picked up by this income tax...district income tax so now we can start some projects, and we can start doing some things in the county, and what you have in reality then is the property tax stays the same, and you have an income tax on top of it.'

Reilly: "The law, which forbids them to raise their rate beyond their legal limit number one, and number two, the voters who won't reelect them if they do that."

Slape: "Yeah, but some counties are leveling below the rate, you know, in realization that they are going to lose that 60¢. What I'm asking is there anything in the law that would put a cap on county government expense?"

Reilly: "There already is in the law a cap on county government levies. No, there's not anything in this Bill that does that. The law already does that."

Slape: "Is there any...is there anything in the Bill?"

Reilly: "I said no."

Slape: "Okay."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

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

Speaker Taylor: "The previous question has been put...all in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Johnson... Reilly, to close."

Reilly: "I would like my hyphenated chief Sponsor to close."

Speaker Taylor: "Representative Wikoff from Champaign to close."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think Representative Reilly has explained the Bill well. It is a new concept, and I think probably one of the better statements made tonight was by Speaker Redmond. I think he said it basically as it is. This is going to help the people who are least able to pay. We are...one of the biggest complaints everyone has is we have to do something to



do something to resolve the terrific increases on the real estate taxes. This is the way to do it. This is permissive legislation. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Taylor: "All in favor of House Bill 447 signify by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this is a tax shift, not a tax increase. It is for homeowners only, not the corporations. There are some administrative difficulties. I think this ought to be on a county by county basis for all taxes rather than school district by school district basis. But on the balance I think it offers an option that taxpayers ought to have. Some comment has been made about the problems that will be around the fringes, around the edges. You know, what if you live in one district and earn your money in another. There is no way that this tax can be more inequitable than the current property tax on homeowners in this state. Absolutely no way. The inequities are so gross for property taxes that that is why this Bill is going to get, you know, 65 to 75 votes. There is a severe problem. And what you're saying by not voting for this Bill is that you don't think your own constituents should have the right to make the choice of how they pay their school taxes. The Sponsor has made significant concessions. This is no longer a tax increase Bill. It is a tax shift Bill. And it seems to me that it merits support."

Speaker Taylor: "Representative Brummer. The Gentleman from Henry, Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I frankly intend to vote 'yes' for this Bill, but let me tell you the phrase...the problems and the questions that have been raised are absolutely real. If you really want to display some guts, open your book to House Bill 2602, and you will find there a Bill that doubles the state income tax and mandatorily erases



the right of the local school district to levy an income ...any type of real estate tax. That's what we've got to be going toward. It abolishes the resource equalizer and says we'll have a flat grant system. If you want the equitable education around the State of Illinois, if you want an equitable tax base, let's get moving in that direction. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd hoped to be recognized prior to this point, but to the best of my knowledge this is not done in any other place in the ...in the country. Secondly, I would suggest to you as State Legislators, I am not sure it is the better part of wisdom for the state to be put in the position of sharing this particular source of revenue with any other unit of government in the state. If you have a state income tax in x number of localities, ...you have a local income tax in x number of localities, and for some reason we have to increase the state income, you would be moving...instead of moving everybody from two and a half to three or three and a half percent if that's where we had to go, you'd be moving some to three and some to three and a half and some to perhaps significantly higher numbers. For that reason, Ladies and Gentlemen, I oppose this Bill."

Speaker Taylor: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 91 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1011, Representative Sandquist."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1011, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Taylor: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill that I'm sure you have received a lot of information on from both sides of the issue, but let's see what's really involved. What we're talking about is that when we have an insurance policy that...that... that provides you can treat mental disorders. It adds to those who are qualified for payment under that policy. Under...under the present time, or at the first...when this was first enacted, the only one who could treat and be reimbursed under a third party payment was a licensed physician. Then about two years ago we added that qualified clinical psychologists...Mr. Speaker, could I have a little order please? As I said, we then later added that qualified clinical psychologists could also be reimbursed in this method. What my Bill does...our Bill, right. Thank you, Mike...it adds that qualified clinical social workers could also be reimbursed. Now, these are not just any social workers. There are people who have a master's degree. There are people who have had a graduate program at a university or other type of institution. In addition, they have to have five years experience. The first...the first two would be under a supervised...under another qualified person, and the next three would be practiced in the field before they would be eligible. That's what this Bill is all about. There was a request for a fiscal note. That has been filed. There is no additional cost to the state. There is a question 'Is this going to cost more for insurance policy?'. Nobody really knows that answer, but I do know this, that I contacted the State of New York which has this, and I will say that there are maybe some differences, but basically where they have it in the State of New York



the Department of Insurance there has required and said that there has not been an increase in the premiums for the people to pay. Now, this does not mandate that you have mental health coverage. I want to make that clear. But it does say where there is mental health coverage, that qualified clinical social workers can also be reimbursed on these policies. I do not think it will add to the expense. I think it is something that is only fair because these are the people who are doing the treatment. There are many areas in this state where there aren't any psychiatrists, and they're needed with people who are qualified to help out, and that is what this is trying to do. And I ask your favorable support."

Speaker Taylor: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Taylor: "He indicates that he will."

Vinson: "Why do you have to get two like this in one day? My real question is, I want to make sure I understand this Bill, Representative. This would..."

Unknown: "I think they do."

Vinson: "...Provide reimbursement for registered clinical social workers, I assume."

Sandquist: "That is correct."

Vinson: "Registered by the Department of Registration and Education?"

Sandquist: "It would be under the Department of Insurance with Amendment 5 that I added onto the Bill."

Vinson: "But they aren't registered by the..."

Sandquist: "But they are...but they are now. They are now qualified under the...with the Department of Registration and Education, and I have a list right here to show that they are now listed."

Vinson: "Under your Bill they won't...the ones that receive reimbursement don't have to be registered with the Department of Registration and Education."



Sandquist: "They do have to be registered with the Department of Insurance, and I think the Department of Insurance would be a better place because they could carry out and make sure that only the qualified people would be reimbursed."

Vinson: "How are they going to determine who is qualified?"

Sandquist: "They are given the power under the Bill to do it, and I believe they are qualified to do it."

Vinson: "So your Bill in addition to providing a new reimbursement system creates...has a new agency involved in licensing functions."

Sandquist: "That is not true because the Department of Insurance filed a fiscal note, and they said there would not be additional costs in this."

Vinson: "But they...they're going to do new licensing. Is that correct?"

Sandquist: "They are...the licensing is now done by the Department of Registration and Education, and..."

Vinson: "This is a new function for the Department of Insurance."

Sandquist: "That is correct."

Vinson: "And it won't cost them any money to do this new function."

Sandquist: "That's what they stated in the fiscal note."

Vinson: "Very interesting. I...I wonder if you could tell me what kind of medical training these people will have to have before they're eligible for the reimbursement."

Sandquist: "As I said...they graduate first of all with some bachelor's degree. Then they get a master's degree in social work. Then they are five years under the program of doing this type of clinical training work. And if that isn't far more work...and far more experience in dealing with mental problems than a baby doctor or a skin doctor would be qualified for it, I don't know what is."

Vinson: "Will they be...will they be required in their work in some situations to distinguish between a problem that





may be caused for medical reasons and a problem that may be a simple...simply a social or a psychological problem?"

Sandquist: "They will certainly not deal with mental problems. . .

I mean with physical problems. They are dealing with mental problems whether you call them psychological or physical or whatever, that is what we're talking about, mental problems."

Vinson: "Are there any mental problems that can be caused in some cases by psychological things and in other cases by medical reasons?"

Sandquist: "I am sure there are mental problems that are caused by any number of things."

Vinson: "Will they have the training to distinguish when it is a medical problem that is causing the situation?"

Sandquist: "I said they will have as much training in this field as a baby doctor or skin doctor."

Vinson: "I'd like to speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Taylor: "Proceed."

Vinson: "I think it is unfortunate that on a day like this Representative Sandquist would have to handle these two Bills. I think he has made a real effort, and I commend him for that, but unfortunately I have to oppose the Bill. The sad situation that we have here is that we're imposing a new licensing requirement on the Department of Insurance. For the first time, they have to look at a health care provider and say whether or not he is qualified to provide health care. Now does that make sense to give that power to the Department of Insurance? Why not to the Department of Public Health or to the Licensing Department, the Department of Registration and Education? It's a piecemeal effort in that sense, and I think that's unfortunate. They don't have the ability to do it and should not do it. In addition to that, we've got a situation where they're going to be treating people who have a mental problem, correctly, as Mr. Sandquist says. The problem is, that mental problem can be caused



by a medical problem or it may be simply a psychological problem. They don't have the training to perceive whether it is a medical problem or psychological problem. That kind of training requires some kind of medical training. Now I agree with Mr. Sandquist that some of the people who provide the kind of care now inappropriately provide this kind of care, and I don't think we ought to reimburse them. But the way to solve the problem is not to say that we're going to take another set of people who are unqualified to do something and reimburse them for that treatment. Therefore, I would urge a 'no' vote on the Bill."

Speaker Taylor: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Willer."

Willer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. We have heard so often that many people who have symptoms of psychological or mental illness really have an underlying physical illness. I will tell you the proportion or percentage of people who come to a psychiatrist, a counselor, or a psychologist that really are suffering from a mental disorder...I mean a physical illness are very very small compared to the people who go to an M.D. with physical complaints and have...but really based...it is a functional illness, or it is based in the psyche. There you find, my doctor told me, 80% of the people who come to him with physical complaints really have nothing physically wrong with them. We don't demand any great psychiatric training on the part of an M.D.. He gets it...a brief course of it when he is in training, and that's it. These counselors who are trained with five years of experience, a master's degree, I have seen them in operation in the township mental health clinics. They are excellent. You don't need a psychiatrist for every type of mental illness or emotional problem. You need someone who is trained to listen to you, to be objective. That's what most people need when they have a psychiatric problem in the first place. A good well-trained counselor knows when a problem is probably physically based, and they have sense



enough to send them to an M.D. or psychiatrist, just as an optometrist who is not an M.D., a good optometrist will send a person..."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I'm rising in support of this Bill, and I'll tell you why. I voted against this Bill two or three times, but I have reviewed it, and I believe that it is right, and I think we all know as we're sitting here that the lobbyist for the Medical Society for the doctors are out around this chamber, and they've been working hard, and they've been lobbying against it because they've got a monopoly locked into this statute, and they don't want to lose it. And that's the truth. Now I'll tell you...I want to tell you why I decided to support this Bill, besides it stands for free choice. I do some divorce work, and a lot of my clients are women who have problems that are really upsets and emotional strains involved with the fact that their husbands may be chasing around with another women or there is something wrong with their family. Now...I have in front of me the Springfield phone book. If you have a client, or a friend, or a constituent that needs some help, they're going to go into the yellow pages and what are they going to look for? Marriage and family counseling, or psychiatrist, or psychologist? And you're going to find if you look through this phone book, you're going to find a mixture. You're going to find Christian ministers. You're going to find social workers. You're going to find doctors, and I could read the names, but they're right here. And you are going to pick out somebody that's in your town, or who's got a name that sounds like a person that you can identify with, and you're going to go to that person. And if they treat you well, and help you well, you're going to continue. And they may help you out of their problem whether they're a doctor or not. And then the problem is, when they get...they're going to learn that



they got a group insurance policy...and they may be told at their place of employment, 'Too bad. The counselor who has been helping you, that you've been paying for, that you're satisfied with, doesn't qualify to be reimbursed because the Illinois General Assembly has got a monopoly locked in the law for the doctor's, and I think that's wrong. I think our constituents ought to be free to go through these yellow pages to pick out somebody that serves them well and to get reimbursed if the problem is the same. As to the cost problem, I used to be a lawyer for an insurance company, and I know that some of the insurance companies are maybe lobbying on this too. If they have a cost problem, they can reduce the coverage, or eliminate the coverage, or put in a deductible, or handle it in some way, but what this Bill stands for is free choice for your constituents and to eliminate a monopoly that one group of pro...medical care professionals have established in this statute, and I think it is wrong. I think Representative Sandquist is right, and I hope we'll have a lot of 'yes' votes and a lot of courageous votes notwithstanding the lobbying."

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

Bowman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill does not change the scope of the authority of the...clinical social workers to provide treatment. They're doing...they will continue to do exactly what they are now doing. The only thing this Bill does in effect is to change the means of payment, provide additional modes of payment for these persons. The only reason why...in my opinion, anyone would oppose this is because you might feel that it would make it more...this kind of treatment more accessible to people, and why would you oppose it on these grounds? Because as the Gentleman from Lake County said, you might be afraid that some of your doctors might complain because some of their



patients might find it easier to go to a clinical social worker. But you don't give the clinical social workers any new authority to conduct any other kind of treatment than they are conducting right now. You know, there are mental health centers all over this state. I've got them in my district. You have them in your district. Those mental health centers are staffed primarily with clinical social workers. A psychiatrist might be attached to them on a very part-time basis. There's clinical social workers providing good quality treatment right now, and I think we ought to provide a means of payment for social workers to put this kind of care more within the reach of the average citizens of this state. That's what this Bill is all about."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill. In contrast to my good friend from Lake County that speaks about the monopoly of one profession, there is no monopoly that has any greater statutory authority and monopoly than the attorneys have in the State of Illinois. And they have one of the most built-in type of monopolies. I think what you have to look at, very frankly, is what you are doing to the process of the Legislature is mandating another paralegal...para...medical individuals to have direct payment from insurance companies for professional services. As the Legislature keeps mandating more and more of these payments directly to these different types of paramedical people, up goes the insurance costs. And that's what you're doing. You're mandating increased costs of insurance premiums to constituents. The next thing we'll have in the Legislature is a Bill probably addressing the fact that insurance companies will have to pay a barber for listening to some of your complaints. So we're going way too far in the passage of this legislation. We border on the area of



of being ridiculous, and this legislation will cost the taxpayers of Illinois to insure...through increased insurance premiums, many, many more thousands of dollars a year.

And I would urge that this Bill be overwhelmingly defeated."

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

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

Speaker Taylor: "The previous question has been put. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Those opposed. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Sandquist to close."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we all know what's involved here. This is fairness for people who are...are doing the work so they can get paid. And it is not going to increase the cost. There is no evidence of that at all. As a matter of fact, it can decrease the cost because clinical social workers don't get the high prices that the doctors get. There is no evidence to that effect. This is a fair Bill for the people who are doing the work, that can do it, and as I said before, I hope you don't try to...because I had another Bill that may not be popular with a lot of people, that shouldn't be compared with this Bill at all. This should be decided on its merit. It is a fair thing to do, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Taylor: "The question is 'Shall House Bill 1011 pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Lady from Cook, Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did want to get in before the vote started, but I was waving my hands and you didn't see me. I wanted to explain that I was concerned about this Bill when it first came up. I've done a lot of research on it, and I'm very satisfied now that we're not giving anything to social workers that they can't handle. I have dealt very closely with family service agencies, and there are many people who do not need to go to a psychiatrist who can benefit as a family by going to a clinical social



worker. They already have this in the State of Illinois, and I have a paragraph here that says, 'In answer to your specific questions, we know of no company that has raised its rates for social work coverage since the initial submission of the rates for coverage in 1978.' I think what we're dealing with here is what is best for people, and what is their free choice, and I ask please add more green lights up there. Thank you."

Speaker Taylor: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this vote probably isn't surprising, but what it tells all of the people in the State of Illinois how very difficult it is for any...any profession really to get themselves, if you will, into the law. Because the laws right now rule them out, and they just cannot make an honest dollar because of the heavy pressure not only of the Illinois Medical Society, but the American Medical Association on a federal level. Now we have probably eight million alcoholics in the country, eight million alcoholics. The licensed physicians aren't going to help the vast majority of alcoholics. These are many of the community agencies...these are many of the hospitals, these are many agencies that are using the clinical workers. They know what is good for the people, and those who suffer know what is good for themselves. And all we're saying is why shouldn't the insurance pay for it. That is the freedom of choice that I think the people deserve; and I think it is just so right that it ought to be passed. This Bill reminds me of so many things that have happened here in the Legislature that I've often get happy when I see the Legislature try to do what is logical and give the people what they've got coming to them. But what we really have here is the position through the Medical Society saying 'We want the whole piece of pie. We want all of the action. Nobody else can come in. We



don't open the door for anybody. We don't care who in this country is sick. We don't care if you want another profession to take care of your illness. We're going to block you out, and we're going to use the Legislature to block you out with our influence and power.' And I think that's wrong."

Speaker Taylor: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 59 voting 'yes', 71 voting 'no'. This Bill having failed to get the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. House Bill 2245, Representative Giorgi."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2245, a Bill for an Act to license, tax, and regulate the business of operating alai frontons, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Taylor: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I know this is a pretty serious Bill to be taken up tonight. I was planning on moving it to Second Reading and probably putting an Amendment on it so that the money derived from alai goes to bail out Chrysler, but I'll not do that tonight. I'll just keep this on Third Reading and give her a shot tonight. This Bill is patterned after the Lottery Bill that I stood before you five years ago and asked you to support. This Alai Control Board is patterned after the Lottery Control Board. There are five Members appointed to the Alai Control Board, three from one Party, two from the other. The Majority Party has three Members. They are confirmed by the Senate, and they only receive \$100 a meeting, and they are mandated to be there at least once a month. Anyone that has anything to do with a fronton where these games are played, and I should confess here tonight that I have never been in an alai fronton in my life, every person employed by a fronton or any person that works in a fronton must be licensed by this Board and the officers of people that might be wanting frontons have to... pre-





sent themselves the strict test. They have to be fingerprinted and mugged, and they have to be clean as... impecable, or clean as a whistle. Now, to build a fronton is four limits in this Bill and no two frontons can be within 50 miles of one another, and only...there are four limits to one year annually in this Bill. To build a fronton it takes an investment of \$28,000,000. The state's pari-mutuel take in a state like Florida or Connecticut which has less population, less economic base than Illinois, has reached \$15,000,000 so that you can anticipate that the pari-mutuel take in Illinois might reach \$20,000,000. The people employed in the fronton number in the hundreds. The money spent in sales tax, income tax, property taxes for corporations, and...are... total would total in the millions of dollars. The state realizes five percent of all the pari-mutuel wagering they get 40¢ for every admission, and they get 50% of all breaks. That was patterned after the race track schedule. Now the...the part of the Bill that is the most thoroughly written is the part where the lottery... the Jai Alai Control Board which is appointed by the Governor and approved by the Senate, controls every aspect of the jai alai fronton just like our Lottery Control Board controls every aspect of the Lottery operation. And you must admit that the Lottery Bill written five years ago didn't need any revisions except for the one revision that allowed for the Instant Game that has proven to be so successful. Now, I know that a lot of you Members have received mail on this Jai Alai Bill. I know there are many that supported it last year. Last year it received 80 votes on May 25, and if there are any questions I would be glad to answer them. This is a model Bill. It is patterned after the other states that have jai alai."

Speaker Taylor: "Is there any discussion? The question is 'Shall House Bill 2245 pass?'. The Gentleman from St.



Clair, Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, since there is no discussion on the thing maybe I could just explain my vote. Go ahead and call the roll, and I'll explain my vote."

Speaker Taylor: "The question is 'Shall House Bill 2245 pass?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Representative Giorgi did a pretty good job in explaining as to how the jai alai will work and if we decide to pass it here... Some of the side benefits in these days of the economy sliding backwards is it...it would encourage a lot of travelers to come to Illinois. You have to go right now to see jai alai all the way to Connecticut, or Florida, or Las Vegas, Nevada. I would suspect that we would draw a lot of tourists from Indiana, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Missouri, Kentucky, and all the surrounding states and maybe as far away as the other states of Ohio, Nebraska, and so forth. There is a great business in hotel and motel business, and the restaurant business and...the 'ripple effect'. I strongly believe that the time for jai alai has come. We've got Lottery. We've got Bingo. We've had horseracing for many years, and this...this law would not be any different than any of those in regard to the gambling aspect. But this is a highly skilled game. One that is played in many parts of the world, and especially those in Spanish speaking parts of the world. And if anyone has ever has the opportunity to see the game, they would certainly enjoy it. It is one that has to depend upon the wagering or it can't succeed. The actual admission itself will not justify the building of a fronton as Representative Giorgi has said. Obviously we're doing pretty bad here, so...and I've used more than a minute. And so, Mr. Speaker, I'll sit down."

Speaker Taylor: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are



54 voting 'yes', 76 voting 'no'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost."

Clerk Leone: "Supplemental #1 to the House Calendar is presently being distributed. Representative Flinn in the Chair."

Speaker Flinn: "On Supplemental Calendar appears House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #43 motion with respect to, and Representative Vinson is recognized. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would ...I would move to discharge the Committee on the Executive..."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment please. One moment. Representative Kane, for what purpose do you arise?"

Kane: "Doesn't some time have to elapse between the distributing of the Supplemental Calendar and the calling of the motion on that Calendar?"

Speaker Flinn: "Not as far as I know on the motions are concerned. I'm not sure."

Kane: "Doesn't one hour...doesn't the Calendar have to be on the desk for one hour before..."

Speaker Flinn: "Give us a moment to check the rules. Representative Kane, your point is well taken. It...the...it appears that the rules pointed out that it must be on the Calendar for the next Legislative Day, so... If you'd like to move, Representative Vinson, it takes 107 votes to suspend that rule."

Vinson: "I believe...it is my recollection from the rules, Mr. Speaker, that if it is on the Calendar it only takes 89."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, we're trying to suspend the rule...suggest how you can suspend the rule. Alright, we're going to back off. I think...Representative Vinson, your point is well taken. We didn't read all the rules."

Vinson: "That's...that's my recollection, too."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kane, if you'd care, I'll quote



the rule to you. Do you have it there? Under 66B it says, 'The motion must be in writing and shall be carried on the daily Calendar for the next Legislative Day under the order of motions. No action shall be taken on the motion until it is on the Calendar. This Subsection B may be suspended by a motion of 107 votes.' The last sentence you can forget, but the fact that it is on the Calendar, it is in order. Proceed, Representative Vinson. Representative Hoffman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Hoffman: "I...I do not have this on my desk, and it has to be on the desk before we consider anything. I object."

Speaker Flinn: "Do you have it on your desk now?"

Hoffman: "Yes, I do."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, proceed, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would move to discharge the Committee on the Executive for further consideration and advance to the order of Constitutional Amendment Second Reading and have read for a second time today House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #43. I believe I have the support of the Spokesman and the Chairman of the Committee and the Leadership on both sides. Because of the hectic schedule, the Committee was unable to consider it in the last week. There will be a full debate on the subject. Everybody will have a chance to look at everything in the Amendment and to vote it up or down. And that is all I'm asking for. I would appreciate your vote. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Brummer is recognized."

Brummer: "Yes, what does the proposed Constitutional Amendment deal with?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Brummer, you were asking a question? I don't think he heard you."

Brummer: "Yes, I was wondering what the topic of the...what the



subject matter was of the House Joint Constitutional Amendment #43."

Speaker Flinn: "Would you explain what the..."

Vinson: "Yes, Representative, it deals with the variety of aspects of the Legislative Article. It provides for four year House terms. It provides for a 60 day Session with a 14 day Veto Session. It provides for a form of biennial budgeting whereby we would consider half of the budget each year rather than the whole budget each year, and it strengthens the Committee structure." Those are the basic items covered."

Brummer: "Was this matter heard in Committee?"

Vinson: "It makes no change in any form. It is neutral on the question of of accumulative voting and multi-Member districts. It would not affect that in any way."

Brummer: "Was this matter voted upon in Committee?"

Vinson: "No, Sir. It has not..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "When was this Constitutional Amendment introduced?"

Vinson: "It was introduced, as I recall, Representative, late last spring. About June 14 of last spring, but it was not assigned to Executive until some time in February or March is my recollection."

Kane: "Where was it in the Interim?"

Vinson: "Committee on Assignments."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Bill...of the House, this is a Constitutional Amendment, I think, that has far-reaching effects. It deals with the whole functioning of the legislative process, and to say that the Executive Committee has not had the opportunity to look at this, and therefore the Committee should be discharged, I think is absolutely nonsense. I think that if we are going to act in this kind of precipitous manner, we might as well abolish all of our Committees, put everything out onto the floor of the House, and have a free-for-all and a zoo. To discharge..."



Speaker Flinn: "Well, Mr. Kane..."

Kane: "...This Constitutional Amendment..."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment, Mr. Kane..."

Kane: "...At this time, I think, is ridiculous."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevich is raising a point of order. What's your point of order?"

Matijevich: "Well, I hate to get back to it, but I just seem to think that...that this, even though it is on the Calendar under Rule 66, cannot be on the Calendar until the next Legislative Day after its motion is put in writing. Isn't that the interpretation of the rules? Well then it is out of order to be heard now, because the motion was made in writing today. It's got to be carried on the Calendar tomorrow, and the purpose for that rule is so that we have time to digest what a motion has in writing. Now that can be suspended, but it takes 107 votes to do it..., and I make that point of order."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, Representative Matijevich, your point is well taken, but the facts are at any time we are suspending the rules and the Gentleman has made a motion to hear it today, we are only going to say it to you that it takes 107 instead of the normal 89. Representative Kane, proceed."

Kane: "This is on a motion to suspend the rules, is that...am I correct?"

Speaker Flinn: "We're taking it as one motion unless someone suggests we divide the motion."

Kane: "No, the motion is pursuant to the rule. I move to discharge the Committee. Now he has to make a motion to suspend the rules before he can even get to this motion."

Speaker Flinn: "Right. If you want, Representative Vinson... so moves."

Kane: "Okay."

Speaker Flinn: "Alright, Representative Kane."

Kane: "Okay...okay, looking at this again, what this motion..."

Speaker Flinn: "Are we talking about one motion now? We have



leave to take this all in one motion so we can settle the issue once and for all?"

Kane: "No..."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, you're asking that we divide the motion?"

Kane: "Yes."

Speaker Flinn: "Divide the issue."

Kane: "Yes."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. We're speaking about the motion to suspend the rules."

Kane: "Motion to suspend the rules. Okay. If we suspend the rule, what we are going to is a motion which not only discharges the Committee but asks for it to be read a second time today which means that there will be no opportunity to offer any Amendments on the floor of the House. I think this is ridiculous, just absolutely ridiculous, and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had forgotten about my... I love the four year term, Sam, but the 60 day Session, what would happen after the 60 days ran out? Would we have to call a Special Session as we do right now?"

Speaker Flinn: "Well, I...go ahead, Representative Vinson. Answer the question. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "A Special Session can be called, but if the Governor calls a Special Session, it has to be approved by the President of the House...the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate under the Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, Representative..."

Vinson: "If I might, Mr. Speaker, just respond to one of Mr. Kane's questions."

Speaker Flinn: "...Go head."

Vinson: "The intention is not to move it on to Third Reading today. The intention is just to get it read a second time for purposes of satisfying the constitutional requirement. I will be perfectly willing to hear and consider any Amendments."



Speaker Flinn: "Representative...Darrow's light's on, but... Representative Darrow, you've been on the longest. I didn't see you there. Sorry."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question has been moved. Representative Vinson to close."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As everybody knows, there is a constitutional deadline by which Amendments have to pass in order to get on the ballot. What I would like to have the opportunity to do is have this concept on legislative reform considered. I would like to sol...have the opportunity to solicit your votes. I think everybody can understand the crunch we have been through. And I appreciate Representative Capparelli being willing to countenance this measure so that we can consider the problem. I...I don't know how I will react to any particular Amendments. My mind is open on the subject, but I would like to have a chance to present this to you, and I very much solicit a 'yes' vote on these motions."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to suspend Rule 66 in order to hear his motion tonight. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. It takes 107 votes to pass. Have all voted who wish? Representative Deuster to explain his vote."

Deuster: "In explaining my 'no' vote, it may be that I am suspicious, but I think everyone ought to see what this is. This is a ridiculous Amendment, and there has been plenty of time to consider it before this. However, the ...whole idea is that if you can get 107 votes, bring this out, somehow approve it, we'll put it on the ballot, and perhaps we will make it impossible for some other more serious efforts to amend the Constitution to be considered. The idea of us voting here tonight to propose that





we extend our two year terms to four year terms, I don't think is going to be well received by our constituents. The beauty of the two year term is that every two years the people can look at us and see whether we are performing and throw us out if we haven't been. The two year term has been with our country and our state for a long time, and for us to vote 'yes' in favor of a four year term is not something that the voters back home are going to be pleased with, I don't think. And I think those who are voting 'yes' ought to think seriously about whether you want the newspapers and the medias back home in your district to say, 'My State Representative voted for a proposal to extend his term for four years.' I don't think the people need that. I don't think that is good government, and I urge more 'no' votes. And I would ask, in the event this gets close to the requisite number of votes, I would insist on a verification of the vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, Representative Deuster, the motion is to suspend the rule. We are not voting on the motion itself. Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "In explaining my 'no' vote because I see everybody rushing down the aisle, and I'm trying to figure out what deal was made. But I...if anybody heard the debate, if this is a Constitutional Amendment Resolution that has to do with the four year terms, did you hear the debate in the Senate about that? One Senator said, 'You mean the House Members can run for the Senate in the middle of his term?' And the answer was yes. He said, 'Oh, then to hell with it.' So what are we wasting our time for. That's not going to go anywhere. I'm not sure what all the action is about because it is not going to get anywhere, and I understand that Resolution didn't get anywhere over there. So...but the real reason I am voting against it, there has been a lot of other motions that other Members have, and for some reason we



passed all over them, and everybody is rushing down the aisle to help Vinson, and I know he's not that popular that he needs all that help. So something is happening, and I'm not sure what, but I'll find out before the night's over."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of this motion, and I didn't realize what was going on at first, but I want to indicate to Representative Vinson that I think this Constitutional Amendment has some merit. I myself introduced this same measure back in January of last year, and I guess it's anguishing in Committee. It didn't deal with as many issues as Representative Vinson is trying to deal with, but I think it is important for each and every one of us as Members of the House to begin to reorganize and restructure this House. One thing that is really holding back a lot of good Legislators in this House is the problem of running for election every two years. I support the situation where we could possibly have a four-four-and two year term on a ten year period, and I think that the Senate should be reorganized and that they should only have to run twice in a ten year period...one for a six year spot and one for a four year spot. I think this measure deserves some merit, and I think we ought to start talking about reform and restructuring our own House, and for those reasons I support this motion."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the issue here is just whether or not this is going to be heard on the floor. Now the Chairman of the Committee indicated that...through Mr...Representative Vinson that he didn't have time to consider it. We're only talking about the issue as to whether or not this should be determined on the



House floor. I think it is a very good idea to do it in that fashion when the Chairman of the Committee himself admits that it was a time problem. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 'ayes', and 31 'nos', and the motion passes. Representative Deuster, you've already explained your vote. What do you want now?"

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, you know as well as you're sitting there that I asked to verify this. Perhaps you forgot. At any rate, I would like to verify this..."

Speaker Redmond: "...I did. You saw that blank look on my face. That meant I forgot."

Deuster: "I suggest that's it."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. I suppose Representative Vinson would like to have a Call of the Absentees. Proceed with a Call of the Absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Absentees. Abramson, Bluthardt, Borchers, Collins, Davis, Ebbesen, Ewell, Gaines, Hoffman, Jaffe, Johnson, Emil Jones, Kelly, Klosak, Laurino, Leinenweber, McCourt, Meyer, Molloy, Pierce, Sandquist, Schlickman, Schneider, Schuneman."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevich, what purpose do you arise?"

Matijevich: "I found out the deal. I change my vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Elinn: "Representative Brummer. Brummer."

Brummer: "I haven't found out the deal yet. Change my vote to 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevich wants to vote 'aye'. Representative Brummer wants to vote 'no'. Proceed with the Call of the Absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Slape, Stearney, Tuerk, Wikoff, Williams, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Deuster, you want to poll the 'yes' votes, I take it. Would you call the 'yes' votes?"

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Ackerman, Alexander,



Anderson, Barnes,..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative J.J. Wolf votes 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Beatty, Bell, Bianco, Birchler, Birkinbine,  
Bower, Bowman, Bradley, Brummer..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bradley wishes to be verified."

Clerk Leone: "Burnidge, Campbell, Capparelli, Capuzi, Casey,  
Chapman, Christensen, Conti, Cullerton, Currie, Dawson,  
DiPrima, Domico, Donovan, Doyle, Ralph Dunn, Ewing,  
Farley, Flinn, Frederick, Garmisa, Getty, Giorgi, Goodwin,  
Griesheimer, Grossi, Hallock, Hallstrom, Hanahan, Hannig,  
Harris, Henry, Hoxsey, Hudson, Huff, Huskey, Dave Jones  
..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Slape votes 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Karpiel, Keane, Kent, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Krska,  
Kucharski, Kulas, Lechowicz, Leon, Leverenz, Madigan,  
Margulas, Marovitz, Matijevich, Matula, Mautino,  
McAuliffe, McBroom, McClain, McGrew, McPike, Mulcahey,  
Oblinger, Patrick, Pechous, Peters, Piel, Polk, Pouncey,  
Preston, Pullen, Rea, Reilly, Richmond, Rigney, Robbins,  
Ronan, Ropp, Ryan, Schisler, Schoeberlein, Schraeder,  
Simms, Slape, Stanley, E.G. Stéele, C.M. Stiehl, Stuffle,  
Sumner, Swanstrom, Taylor, Telscer, Terzich, Totten,  
VanDuyne, Vinson, Vitek, VonBoeckman, Walsh, Watson,  
White, Winchester, J.J. Wolf, Sam Wolf, Woodyard,  
Younge, and Yourell."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Deuster's questions on the  
affirmative votes."

Deuster: "Alexander."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Alexander's in her seat."

Deuster: "Birchler."

Speaker Flinn: "Birchler's in his seat as always."

Deuster: "Bowman."

Speaker Flinn: "Who?"

Deuster: "Bowman...where..."

Speaker Flinn: "There he is right over here."

Deuster: "Okay,..."



Speaker Flinn: "The walking fire hazard."

Deuster: "Capparelli."

Speaker Flinn: "Capparelli, I don't see the Gentleman in his seat. Is he on the floor? How does the Gentleman vote?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Deuster: "Capuzi."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Capuzi, I don't see him in his seat. Is the Gentleman on the floor? How did the Gentleman vote?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the roll."

Deuster: "Casey."

Speaker Flinn: "Who?"

Deuster: "Casey."

Speaker Flinn: "..."

Deuster: "Casey...at the back."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Casey. How did the Gentleman vote?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the roll."

Deuster: "Is that Mrs. Chapman back there? I guess..."

Speaker Flinn: "That's her."

Deuster: "Christensen."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Christensen...he's in his seat."

Deuster: "Cullerton."

Speaker Flinn: "Cullerton, right there."

Deuster: "Dawson."

Speaker Flinn: "Dawson...in his seat."

Deuster: "DiPrima I see. Domico..."

Speaker Flinn: "Domico...Domico...Representative Domico...I don't see him in his seat. Is the Gentleman on the floor? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the roll."



Deuster: "Donovan."

Speaker Flinn: "Donovan...Representative Donovan...Tim Donovan's  
not in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the roll."

Deuster: "Ewing."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ewing." I don't see the Gentleman  
in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the roll."

Deuster: "Farley."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Farley. I can't see him back in  
the dark. Is Representative Farley back there? He's  
not back there. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the roll."

Deuster: "Dwight Friedrich."

Speaker Flinn: "Dwight Friedrich...The Gentleman is not in his  
seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the roll."

Deuster: "Garmisa."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Garmisa...he's in his seat."

Deuster: "Getty."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Getty. The Gentleman is not in  
his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the roll."

Deuster: "Griesheimer."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Griesheimer. The Gentleman is  
not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the roll."

Deuster: "Hallock."

Speaker Flinn: "Who?"

Deuster: "Hallock, John Hallock,...oh, there you are."



Speaker Flinn: "Right here."

Deuster: "Henry."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Henry."

Deuster: "Sure enough. Hoxsey."

Speaker Flinn: "Hoxsey..."

Deuster: "We're on to Hoxsey now. I see Henry. Hoxsey...Betty  
Hoxsey."

Speaker Flinn: "Who are you asking for?"

Deuster: "Hoxsey. H-o-x-s-e-y."

Speaker Flinn: "She's sitting right back there. Oh, she's not?  
I thought you saw her, and I didn't. The Lady is not  
in her seat."

Deuster: "I don't see her."

Speaker Flinn: "How is she recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Flinn: "Remove her from the roll."

Deuster: "Huff."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Doug Huff...The Gentleman is  
not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'!"

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the roll."

Deuster: "Keane."

Speaker Flinn: "Say that again."

Deuster: "Keane."

Speaker Flinn: "Keane...right back there!"

Deuster: "Kent."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kent...The Lady is not in her  
seat. How is she recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Flinn: "Remove her from the roll."

Deuster: "Kucharski."

Speaker Flinn: "Kucharski...Representative J. David Jones  
would like to be verified. Kucharski...The Gentleman  
is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the roll."



Deuster: "Leverenz."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ted Leverenz. The Gentleman is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the roll."

Deuster: "Margulas...I can't see..."

Speaker Flinn: "Bill Margulas...back there...in his seat..."

Deuster: "Okay, I see him. Marovitz."

Speaker Flinn: "Margulas...Representative Marovitz in the aisle."

Deuster: "Well, he was out somewhere. Matula."

Speaker Flinn: "Matula. He's in his seat."

Deuster: "Mautino."

Speaker Flinn: "Mautino. Representative Mautino is not...there he is. Right over my right, down the row."

Deuster: "Sure enough. McAuliffe."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McAuliffe in the center aisle."

Deuster: "McBroom."

Speaker Flinn: "McBroom...The Gentleman is not in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the roll."

Deuster: "McGrew."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Leverenz has returned. Put him back on the roll. McGrew is in his seat."

Deuster: "Patrick."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Patrick...in his seat."

Deuster: "Polk."

Speaker Flinn: "Polk."

Deuster: "Oh, there he is."

Speaker Flinn: "Right there in the middle aisle."

Deuster: "Pouncey."

Speaker Flinn: "Pouncey...in his seat. No, here he is over here."

Deuster: "Preston. He's over...he's over here."

Speaker Flinn: "Preston. Lee Preston. Preston. There he is back in the back."

Deuster: "Richmond...Ronan."





Speaker Flinn: "Representative Al Ronan...The Gentleman is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Re...take him from the roll. Representative Lee Daniels..."

Deuster: "Schisler."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Daniels votes 'aye'. Put Capuzi back on, and McAuliffe back on, and Al Ronan back on... Slow down just a bit. The Clerk has got to keep up with us. Just a minute. Mc...Was...was Reed removed, Mr. Clerk? Reed. Was she...Oh, I...Representative Reed, I'm sorry, you're trying to get the floor?"

Reed: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Flinn: "For what purpose do you arise?"

Reed: "Change me to 'aye' please."

Speaker Flinn: "Change Representative Reed from whatever she is to 'aye'." Alright, proceed, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Scneider. Glen Schneider."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Glen Schneider...the Gentleman's not in his seat. Is he on the floor? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off anyway."

Deuster: "Yeah, that's right. Schraeder." There he is."

Speaker Flinn: "Schraeder's in his seat."

Deuster: "Slape...Slape."

Speaker Flinn: "Slape...How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the roll."

Deuster: "Terzich."

Speaker Flinn: "Terzich." There's Slape. Put Slape back on. Representative Terzich is not in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the roll."

Deuster: "Totten."



Speaker Flinn: "Representative Totten...He is on his way. The Gentleman is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the roll."

Deuster: "VanDuyne."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative VanDuyne's in his seat."

Deuster: "Oh, there he is in all his glory. Vinson...I see. VonBoeckman."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative VonBoeckman...The Gentleman is not in his seat. Is he on the floor? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him from the roll."

Deuster: "Walsh."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative William Walsh...Bill Walsh is not in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him from the roll."

Deuster: "J.J. Wolf."

Speaker Flinn: "J.J. Wolf...the Gentleman is in the back."

Deuster: "Sure enough. Sam Wolf."

Speaker Flinn: "Sam Wolf is in his seat."

Deuster: "Bus Yourell."

Speaker Flinn: "Bus Yourell is...right here."

Deuster: "No further questions."

Speaker Flinn: "He can't 'putt' very well, but he's here."

Deuster: "No further questions. What's the count?"

Speaker Flinn: "Mr...VonBoeckman, place him back on the roll. Representative Campbell, for what purpose do you rise?"

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, have I been taken off the Roll Call?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Reilly. Reilly."

Reilly: "Same question. I've been back and forth. Am I still on the Roll Call?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "McAuliffe. Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Yeah, I wonder if I've been recorded as voting 'aye'



on this?"

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

McAuliffe: "Thank you. Keep it that way."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schoeberlein. Representative Schoeberlein wants to be verified. Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

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

Huskey: "Leave it that way."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Was I taken off the roll?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Representative O'Brien wants to vote 'aye'. Put him back on. Representative O'Brien, you weren't taken off. Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I be verified please?"

Speaker Flinn: "Could the Gentleman be verified? Yes, you are verified. Representative Bower. Bower."

Bower: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded as voting?"

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

Bower: "Keep me that way."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Yesh, I realize a lot of these fellows are engaged in a little filibuster here while they try and dredge up the bodies, and I don't mind. I won't object. You can just stand there and sit there till we get the vote, and I just want to make sure its an honest count. That's all..."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, you'll get one. I'll guarantee you that. Representative Celeste Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Am I on the Roll Call?"

Clerk Leone: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Stiehl: "Fine. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Catania...you have your light on."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'no'."



Catania: "Please change that to 'aye'."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Epton...you have your light on. He wants to vote 'aye'. Epton, 'aye'. Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, one of the provisions in this Amendment limits Members to three terms, and that's it, and I would continue voting 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, you were trying to get my attention?"  
Mr. Speaker votes 'aye'. Mr. Ackerman. How is Mr. Ackerman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "I wasn't recorded. If...I heard Monroe take me off when I wasn't recorded, but I would like to be properly recorded as a 'no' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "I think you were recorded as not voting, and we removed you as not voting. We took you off anyway."  
Representative Jack Davis...'aye', Davis. Ewing, 'aye'. Schuneman, 'aye'. Simms, 'aye'. I got so many of them. Just a minute. Leinenweber. Leinenweber, 'aye'. Gaines, 'aye'. Did you keep up with me? You didn't keep up? On this question there are 112 'aye', and 37 'no', and the motion received the Constitutional Majority...three-fifths Majority rather, is declared passed. Now Representative Vinson is recognized on House Joint Constitutional Amendment #43."

Vinson: "Mr. Spaker, I would ask for leave..."

Speaker Flinn: "This is the motion to discharge rather than the Constitution."

Vinson: "I would ask for leave to use the same Roll Call on the motion to discharge the Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "There is an objection. Objection has been raised. Objection has been raised. Representative Deuster objects."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would move to discharge the Committee on Executive from further consideration and advance to the



order of Constitutional Amendments Second Reading and to have read for a second time today House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #43."

Speaker Flinn: "Any discussion? If not, the question is 'Shall the Committee be discharged on House Joint Constitutional Amendment #43. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. 89 votes is all this takes now. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will...the Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 108 'ayes', 21 voting 'no', and the motion passes. The Committee is discharged on House Joint Constitutional Amendment #43. We'll read this in perfunctory at the end of the business day today. House Bill 2022, Representative Taylor. Just one moment, Representative Taylor. Representative Kane, for what purpose do you arise?"

Kane: "Well, I think that since this Amendment hasn't been heard in Committee and nobody has had a chance to hear it or know what's in it, and there has been no testimony. Nobody knows what's there. I think we ought to read it a second time now."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, it is not before us now. We've already gone to the next Bill, and we will discuss it fully at the time...at the proper time."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2022, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2022 is the Bill that we had a little confusion about the other day. It amends the Election Code. It removes the provision against election commissions in cities, villages, and incorporated towns with a population of over 200,000. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill was put in a few years ago, and it was put in for the purpose of helping one individual



That individual is no longer...no longer a Member of the Board of Elections Commission. He is gone forever. We do have one Member there, a very competent lawyer, that runs the Chicago Board of Elections and is clear of \$25,000 a year. All that this asks is that he be able to practice law in his spare time. There is no other Board of Election Commission in the State of Illinois that has that provision. I solicit your support for this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Bill. It...the case is just as Representative Taylor explained it. There has been a mistaken impression that this is the so called Medley Movers Bill. Mr. Medley has not been a Member of this Board for over a year. As Representative Taylor said, this Bill...this law applies only to Chicago and to no other election authority in the state. It does state...the law states, and this Bill changes nothing, that the Chairman and the Members of the Board shall be full-time employees of that Board, and I emphasize that. They, under the law and under this Bill; they will be full-time employees of the Board. The only difference is that if a Member was a member of a law firm, he could retain his interest in a law firm. He could work as time allowed him to work in his law practice or in any other business co...enterprise. But it would do nothing to dilute the law that says he must be a full-time Member. I think there has been a great deal of misunderstanding on this Bill, and I think that I contributed to it for which I apologize. And I would urge...I would urge an affirmative vote on this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is 'Shall House Bill 2022 pass?'. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted



who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 'ayes', 10 voting 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Record Katz 'aye' on the last Bill. Katz, 'aye'. We're going to do three call back Bills. The first one is House Bill 942, Representative Vinson. Senate Bill I guess it is. Senate Bill 942. It is a call back. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 942 is a pro-life Bill that in essence immunizes from liability anybody who, by virtue of their position, ..."

Speaker Flinn: "You don't want to return it to Second Reading?"

Vinson: "No, we did that...we did that either yesterday or early today and took the...the Amendment off. I don'..."

Speaker Flinn: "Well,..."

Vinson: "I'm satisfied with the posture now."

Speaker Flinn: "Alright...alright. Take it out of the record then. We were only calling it back thinking there were further Amendments."

Vinson: "Oh, oaky. Okay."

Speaker Flinn: "The next one for call back is 2272, Representative Kane. He asks leave to return it to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Kane: "I think it is on Second, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Oh, alright. It's on Second. Read the Bill a second time."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2272, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Oh, Amendments #1 and 2 adopted in Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "Are there any motions pertaining to those Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."



Speaker Flinn: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Kane: "This Amendment is numbered number four, but it probably should be number three."

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, Kane, amends House Bill 2272 as amended."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #4 is a very simple Amendment, and it becomes the Bill, and it essentially says that multiple sessions on schools could be counted as full days only for a period of two years, and that would be the limit. What it would do is tell school districts that if they are in overcrowded conditions that they would have two years to get out of that."

Speaker Flinn: "Any discussion? The question is 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted to House Bill 2272?'. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. House Bill...House Bill 842, Representative Marovitz...has leave to return this to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. It's on Second now. Okay."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #7, Greiman-Marovitz, amends enrolled House Bill 842 on page one by deleting line one and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Marovitz: "I believe this is Amendment #8, Mr. Speaker. There was some technical difficulties, and I believe that Amendment...which we will be considering is Amendment #8 which encompasses...incorporates Representative Vinson's Amendment #5."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ryan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Ryan: "Question of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Yes."

Ryan: "I understand that you have a list there that...requested by the Chair earlier this evening that you were going to





follow. You've jumped over Representative Jones' Bill after repeatedly being asked to call the Bill. Is there any reason that you haven't called Representative Jones' Bill?"

Speaker Flinn: "We deferred...we were deferring all of the Postponed Bills is why we never got to that, and now we're on the call-back to try to amend some Bills so they will be in shape to pass tomorrow, and then we've got a couple of motions here we've got to do tonight, and then that is going to be it...for the night."

Ryan: "Then you're not in fact following the list as was prescribed earlier."

Speaker Flinn: "Oh, we followed...we had followed the list up till now. We're getting ready to wind down."

Ryan: "Yeah, but you jumped over Jones' Bill earlier. I don't..."

Speaker Flinn: "We jumped over Jones and everybody else that had one on Postponed Consideration."

Ryan: "Alright, thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Any discussion on Amendment #7 to House Bill 842? If not...all those...it's #8 really. Change the number to eight. All those in favor of adopting Amendment #8 to House Bill 842...The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #7. Correct?"

Marovitz: "Table Amendment #7. Table Amendment #7. Withdraw Amendment #7...whichever...whichever our able Parliamentarian wishes to do. And move the adoption of Amendment #8."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Marovitz, we've got a little confusion. What they did when you offered to change the Amendment, and it would normally have been #8, they caught it before it got to the printer, and they changed #7 and corrected it. So we're dealing with #7 Amendment right now. And so there's only one minor change on the thing. They caught it, and we...we are dealing with #7. It is exactly like you asked."

Marovitz: "Okay...if that is the case, then I'll move the



adoption of Amendment #7."

Speaker Flinn: "Any discussion? Not...Now I hate to inform you, but you just withdrew #7, and we're going to vote on #8."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, whatever you'd like me to do, I will do whatever your heart desires...If you'd like Amendment #7..."

Speaker Flinn: "Alright, any discussion on Amendment #8?"

Marovitz: "Fine, move the adoption of Amendment #8 at the Gentleman's request."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #8 to House Bill 842..."

Marovitz: "Would you change the Board, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Flinn: "All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Madigan is recognized for the purpose of making a motion to suspend the posting rule. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I believe we did that, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Clerk, has that been accomplished?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Keane on a motion for House Joint Resolution #94. Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask leave to waive the appropriate rules for the immediate consideration of House...House Joint Resolution 94. I've talked to the Leadership on both sides of the aisle regarding this. The Resolution addresses a requirement that the Legislature put on Cook County regarding the Cook County Hospital and the legislation we enacted last year. In that legislation we asked that Cook County submit to us a plan by which the facilities would be operated in a fiscally responsible manner. The plan of operation..."



we asked for that by May 1, 1980. As you know, the legislative...the Auditor General has recently completed his audit. The audit was turned over to Cook County. They use that audit on the basis of the... they argued on that audit as a basis for developing their plan, and only recently on April 21 entered into a contract with the Hiatt medical management to manage the hospital. What the Resolution asked, and it only asks for an extension of time to submit the plan from May 1, 1980 to October 1, 1980. I ask for your favorable consideration. I ask for leave. I'm sorry."

Speaker Flinn: "Do we have leave for immediate consideration? Representative Gaines objects. Representative Keane now moves that we suspend the rules so we may have immediate hearing for...this requires 107 votes. It requires 107 votes to suspend the rules. House Joint Resolution #94...All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Keane."

Keane: "Yes, I would like to explain my vote. Some people are ...I would like to reiterate that what the...what the Cook County is asking for is the...an extension so that they can meet the require...it is impossible for them to meet the requirements, and it is impossible for the Hiatt Medical Management Service to meet the requirements ...the deadline of May 1 since they will have been in operation of the hospital for less than 10 days when May 1 rolls around. All we're asking for is to insure that...insure the hospital enough time to comply with our requirements."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I'd just like to explain my 'present' vote in relation to this report. I read with some dismay in the paper this week on the way down to Springfield that the Hiatt Medical Group just received a \$500,000,000 contract to operate Cook County Hospital



for the next three years. That group will be providing five full-time employees to take the place of the Hospital Governing Commission. I don't know what that breaks down to on a salary basis, but I am sure there were some estimates, and I'm sure that this report could be provided to us, and I think...that's \$200,000 per man...okay...I think the report ought to be put on our desk before this General Assembly takes any action. I think this is a bad move. I think we ought to lay the problems of the hospital out on the table, and if there are some severe problems, then we shouldn't have entered into that contract. I'm voting 'present'."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Lechowicz, you have your light on." Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 107 'ayes', nine voting 'nay', and the motion passes. Representative Keane on the Resolution."

Keane: "I ask for the same...I ask for your favorable consideration of the Resolution which only extends and provides us...it will hopefully give us a very good plan. It will give the new management people a chance to develop a plan which is realistic and provide the General Assembly. I ask...leave for the same Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "Is there leave for the same Roll Call? No objections, same Roll Call. The Resolution is adopted. On the order of motions, Representative Braun has moved on a motion on Senate Bill 860...pursuant...pursuant to Rule '68' having voted on the prevailing side. I move to re...reconsider the vote by which the Bill lost on passage. Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This issue came up yesterday in this House, and occasioned a great emotional debate. I frankly don't know all the particular...part of that debate, but on behalf of my seatmate and on behalf of the interest of the people of the State of Illinois in having this issue



reconsidered, I move pursuant to Rule 62A to have... and having voted on the prevailing side, to have this Bill reconsidered by the voted in which it was won. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Any discussion? There being no discussion, all those in favor...Represent...turn your light on, Phil. Representative Phil Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill costs us an awful lot of time, and effort, and debate yesterday. It would have been a simple matter at one time to exceed to a simple request to take the Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment which was denied by the Speaker...by the Sponsor of this Bill, and I think...I think it is inconsiderate to ask this House to go through this thing again. Now since this happened yesterday, I understand that an identical or a near identical Bill has been voted out of Committee in the House. We will have another opportunity to consider that Bill. Now if we're getting into an inter-district squabble as to who takes credit for a Bill, I think...we're ill advised to do so. This Bill had every opportunity yesterday and went down. We've got another Bill to consider, and I suggest that we reject this motion to reconsider...and is it still in control of the House...I would ask, and how many votes the issue would takes I would ask further?"

Speaker Flinn: "I would guess 89 before I ask him. Representative Rea."

Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I have met with a number of the Members on both sides of the aisle. I've been asked to bring the Bill back for reconsideration. We have discussed it, and we'll be glad to move it in terms of after bringing it back of taking it back to Second Reading to hear an Amendment that has been offered. I think this Bill is very important to the State of Illinois. It is one that we



need to consider at this time, and it is one that has already passed the Senate. It would be ready to move immediately upon if we make our decision here tonight."

Speaker Flinn: "The...any further discussion? The motion is by Representative...the motion is by Representative Braun that the vote by which House Bill 860 lost be reconsidered. She moves on the grounds of voting on the prevailing side. Representative Collins, for what purpose do you rise? You've already spoke on the motion."

Collins: "Well, yes. I am rising on a point of parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Flinn: "State your point."

Collins: "The motion is that the vote be reconsidered. I suggest that the Bill is on the table and no longer in the control of the House and cannot be reconsidered."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, it couldn't have went to the Senate. It lost. It is still in our control."

Collins: "Well then doesn't...it has to be taken from the table, I believe. Is the motion..."

Speaker Flinn: "It wasn't tabled. It lost on a motion. It didn't get 89 votes."

Collins: "The motion is in writing I take it."

Speaker Flinn: "The motion is to reconsider."

Collins: "Alright then if it gets 89 votes I ask for a verification."

Speaker Flinn: "That's fine. You have a right to do that. All those in favor of the motion vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Ropp, you want to explain your vote?"

Ropp: "Yes, I would like to explain my vote. The reason for the problem yesterday was apparently one within the House which did not permit some considerations for an Amendment, and that has been granted at this time, and at least to attempt to bring it back to Second Reading



for that consideration in line with the normal policy of the House, and I am voting 'yes' on that accord."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 70 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'no', and the motion loses. Representative Rea."

Rea: "I would like to Poll the Absentees."

Speaker Flinn: "You're entitled to that. The Clerk will Poll the Absentees as soon as the roll comes out. In order to expedite the thing there is going to be quite a few absentees, 91. It is going to take a while. If you would like to change your vote, change it at that time when your name is called. Do not interrupt the call of the absentees. Hold up your hand. I'll be looking for you as your name is called. ...The Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Balanoff, Beatty, Bianco, Bluthardt, Borchers, Bowman, Bradley, Campbell, Casey, Catania, Chapman, Christensen, Davis, Domico, Donovan, Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Ebbesen, Epton, Ewell, Ewing, Friedrich, Gaines, Getty, Greiman, Griesheimer, Harris, Hoffman, Hoxsey, Huskey, Jaffe, Johnson, Emil Jones, Kane, Karpiel, Katz,..."

Speaker Flinn: "Piel...Karpiel, oh, I'm sorry. Karpiel, 'aye'. 'No', I'm sorry. You're back in the dark, Lady. I just can't see you so far back there. Hi Dorothy."

Clerk O'Brien: "Katz, Keane, Kelly, Kent, Klosak, Kucharski, Laurino, Leinenweber, Leverenz, Macdonald, Mahar, Margulas, Matula, McAuliffe, McBroom, McCourt, McGrew, McMaster, McPike, Meyer, Molloy, Mugalian, Neff, Pechous, Peters, Pierce, Polk, Pullen, Reed, Reilly, Richmond, Sandquist, Schlickman, Schneider,..."

Speaker Flinn: "Put Schneider 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schoeberlein, Schuneman, Simms, Skinner, Slape, Stearney, E.G. Steele, C.M. Stiehl, Totten, Tuerk, VanDuyne, Vinson,..."

Speaker Flinn: "Vinson, 'aye'."



- Clerk O'Brien: "Walsh, Watson,..."
- Speaker Flinn: "Watson, 'aye'."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Wikoff, Willer, Williams, Winchester, Jake Wolf, Sam Wolf, Yourell, no further."
- Speaker Flinn: "Boucek, 'no'. Reilly, 'aye'."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Boucek 'aye' to 'no'."
- Speaker Flinn: "Anderson from 'no' to 'aye'. This motion received 74 'ayes', 15 'nos', and the motion loses. Thank you. We have five requests for change of votes."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Jake Wolf and Piel request to vote 'aye' on House Bill 524."
- Speaker Flinn: "Is there leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Kelly requests to vote 'aye' to vote 'aye' on Amendment #2 to House Bill 515."
- Speaker Flinn: "Is there leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Leverenz requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 1011."
- Speaker Flinn: "Is there ob...any objections? Hearing no objections, leave is granted."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Mulcahey requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 1387."
- Speaker Flinn: "Is there leave? Leave is granted."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Preston requests to vote 'aye' on Amendment #4 to House Bill 2104."
- Speaker Flinn: "Is there leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Ebbesen requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3003."
- Speaker Flinn: "Is there leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Messages from the Senate."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Messages from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary."
- Speaker Flinn: "Representative Madigan, for what purpose do you rise?"





Madogan: "Simply to inform the Membership that our plan is to provide a perfunctory Session after we leave for the reading of the messages from the Senate, and that the Constitutional Amendments which are part of those messages will be read for the first time tonight. And, Mr. Speaker, is there any further business?"

Speaker Flinn: "I am informed there is no further business. You are recognized for the purpose of making a motion to adjourn."

Madigan: "Providing a perfunctory Session to be determined by the Clerk. I now move that we adjourn till 10 a.m. tomorrow morning."

Speaker Flinn: "You've heard the motion. All those in favor say 'aye', all those oppose say 'no', and the House is adjourned."

Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed the following Bills, the following title and passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Bills number 1484, 1615, 1646, 1652, and 1981, passed by the Senate April 24, 1980. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit, Senate Joint Resolution #1 Constitutional Amendment resolved by the Senate of the 81st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein that they should be submitted to the electors of this state for adoption or rejection in the general election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Section 8 of Article 4. The Constitution will



read as follows: Article 4 Section 8, passage of Bills 8. The enacting clause of laws of this state should, be it enacted by the people of the State of Illinois represented in the General. B) The General Assembly shall enact laws only by Bill. Bills may originate in either House, but may be amended or rejected by the other. C) No Bill shall be a law without a concurrence of the Majority of the Members elected to each House. Final passage of Bills shall be by recorded vote. In the Senate, at the request of two Members, and in the House at the request of five Members, a record vote may be taken on any other occasion. A record vote is a vote of yeas and nays entered on the journal. D) A Bill shall be read by title on three different days in each House. A Bill and each Amendment thereto shall be reproduced and placed on the desks of each Member before final passage. Bills, except Bills for the appropriation and for the codification, revision, rearrangement of laws, shall be confined to one subject. Appropriation Bills shall be limited to the subject of appropriations. A Bill expressly amending a law shall set forth completely the Sections amended. The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate shall sign each Bill that passes both Houses to certify that the procedural requirement for passage has been met. E) Underlined. During the period after a general election and before the convening of the new General Assembly on the second Wednesday of January next ensuing, no vote may be taken on any Bill which proposes any change in salary or allowances required by this Constitution to be provided by law. Schedule. This Amendments takes effect upon its approval by the electors. Adopted by the Senate April 23, 1980 by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary of the Senate, First Reading of the Constitutional Amendment. Messages from the Senate by



Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolutions, the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Joint Resolution #16 Constitutional Amendment. Resolved by the Senate of the 81st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the state for adoption or rejection at the general election occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Sections 5 and 6 of Article IV Section 13 of Article V and Section 2 of Article VIII of the Constitution to read as follows: Article IV Section 5, Sessions. A) The Sessions of the General Assembly shall convene at 12 o'clock noon on the second Wednesday of January in the next year ensuing the election of Members thereof, and at no other time, unless as provided by this Constitution. B) The Governor may convene the General Assembly or the Senate alone in Special Session by a proclamation stating the purpose of the Session; and only business encompassed by such purpose, together with any impeachments or confirmation of appointments shall be transacted. Special Sessions of the General Assembly may also be convened by joint proclamation of the presiding officers of both Houses, issued as provided by law. C) Sessions of each House of the General Assembly and meetings of Committees, Joint Committees, and Legislative Commissions shall be open to the public. Sessions and Committee meetings of a House may be closed to the public if two-thirds of the Members elected to that House determine that the public interest so requires; and meetings of Joint Committees and Legislative Commissions may also be closed if two-thirds of the Members elected to each House so determine.



Section 6. Organization. A) A Majority of the Members elected to each House constitutes a quorum. B) On the first day of each Regular Session of the General Assembly, the Secretary of State shall convene the House of Representatives to elect from its Membership a Speaker of the House of Representatives as presiding officer, and the Governor shall convene the Senate to elect from its Membership a President of the Senate as presiding officer. C) For purpose of powers of appointment conferred by this Constitution, the Minority Leader of either House is a Member of the numerically strongest political Party other than the Party to which the Speaker or the President belongs, as the case may be. D) Each House shall determine the rules of its proceedings, judge the elections, returns and qualifications of its Members and choose its officers. No Member shall be expelled by either House, except by a vote of two-thirds of the Members elected to that House. A Member may be expelled only once for the same offense. Each House may publish...punish by imprisonment any person, not a Member, guilty of disrespect to the House by disorderly or contemptuous behavior in its presence. Article V Section 13. Governor-Legislative messages. The Governor at the beginning of each regular Session of the General Assembly and at the close of his term of office, shall report to the General Assembly on the condition of the state and recommend such measures as he deems desirable. Article VIII. Section 2. State Finance. A) The Governor shall prepare and submit to the General Assembly, at a time prescribed by law, a state budget for the ensuing fiscal biennium. The budget shall set forth the estimated balance of funds available for appropriation at the beginning of the fiscal biennium, the estimated receipts, and a plan for expenditures and obligations during the fiscal biennium of every department, authority,



public corporation, and quasi-public corporation of the state, every state college and university, and every other public agency created by the state, but not units of local government or school districts. The budget shall also set forth the indebtedness and contingent liabilities of the state and other information as may be required by law. Proposed expenditures shall not exceed funds estimated to be available for the fiscal biennium as shown in the budget. B) The General Assembly by law shall make appropriations for all expenditures of public funds by the state. Appropriations for a fiscal year shall not exceed funds estimated by the General Assembly to be available during that biennium. Schedule. The foregoing Amendment to the Constitution takes effect on the second Wednesday in January next after its adoption by the electors. Adopted by the Senate April 23, 1980 by three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary of the Senate. First Reading of the Constitutional Amendment. You're welcome. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Joint Resolution #25 Constitutional Amendment. Resolved by the Senate of the 81st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of this state, at the general election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Sections 8 and 12 of and to add Sections 12.1, 12.2, and 12.3 to Article VI of the Constitution, the amended and added Sections to read as follows: Article VI. The Judiciary. Section 8. Associate Judges. Each circuit court shall have such number of associate judges as



provided by law. In a judicial circuit which adopts Sections 12.1 and 12.3 by a local option referendum, associate judges shall be selected by appointment in the manner provided by those Sections; otherwise, associate judges shall be appointed by the circuit judges in each circuit as the Supreme Court shall provide by rule.

In the Cook County Circuit, unless otherwise provided by law, at least one-fourth of the associate judges shall be appointed from, and reside, outside Chicago. The Supreme Court shall provide by rule for matters to be assigned to associate judges. Section 12. Election of circuit judges. A) In a judicial circuit which adopts Sections 12.1 and 12.3 by a local option referendum, circuit judges shall be selected in the manner provided by those Sections; otherwise, in the manner provided by paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) of this Section. B) Circuit judges shall be nominated at primary elections or by petition and shall be elected at general or judicial elections as provided by law. A person eligible for the office of circuit judge may cause his name to appear on the ballot as a candidate for the circuit judge at the primary and at the general or judicial elections by submitting petitions. The General Assembly shall prescribe by law the requirements for petitions. C) The office of a circuit judge shall be vacant upon the incumbent's death, resignation, retirement, removal, or upon the conclusion of a term without retention in office. Whenever an additional circuit judge is authorized by law, the office shall be filled in the manner provided for filling a vacancy in that office. D) A vacancy occurring in the office of circuit judge shall be filled as the General Assembly may provide by law or, in the absence of a law, by appointment by the Supreme Court. A person appointed to fill a vacancy 60 or more days prior to the next primary election to nominate circuit judges shall serve



until the vacancy is filled for a term at the next general or judicial election. A person appointed to fill a vacancy less than 60 days prior to the next primary election to nominate circuit judges shall serve until the vacancy is filled at the second general election following such appointment. Section 12.1. Appointment of judges of Supreme Court and appellate court, and circuit courts upon adoption. A) The provisions of this Section shall govern the selection of those circuit judges and associate judges of the circuit court of any circuit which adopts this Section and Section 12.3 by a local option referendum. For purposes of this Section, the term 'judge' includes all judges of the Supreme Court, and appellate court, and all circuit and associate judges of the circuit courts except where a distinction is indicated. B) Judges shall be appointed by the Governor from nominees submitted by Judicial Nominating Commissions, except when appointed by the Supreme Court in accordance with paragraph (f) of this Section. C) The office of a judge shall be vacant upon the incumbent's death, resignation, retirement, removal, or upon the conclusion of a term or whenever an additional judge is authorized by law. D) When a vacancy occurs in the office of judge, the administrative director of the Illinois courts shall so notify the appropriate Nominating Commission, who shall immediately convene the Commission. E) Within 28 days after the delivery of the notice of a vacancy, the Commission shall submit to the Governor a list of three qualified persons to fill the vacancy. If there is more than one vacancy among associate judges of the same circuit, or among circuit judges of the same circuit court, or on either the Supreme Court or the appellate court from the same judicial district, the number of qualified persons on the list or lists shall be three times the number of the respective vacancies.



However, within that 28 day period, the Commission, by certifying in writing by its Chairman to the Governor that additional time is required, may take additional time not in excess of 28 days. If within 28 days after delivery to the Commission of the notice of a vacancy, the Commission determines and certifies to the Supreme Court that the number of qualified persons available is fewer than three times the number of vacancies, the Supreme Court shall notify the Commission within 14 days thereafter whether its determination has been accepted or rejected by the court. If the determination is accepted, or if the court makes no response within the period, the Commission shall submit the list to the Governor forthwith; if the determination is rejected, the Commission shall continue its search for qualified persons for an additional period not to exceed fourteen days before submitting the list to the Governor. F) Immediately upon receipt of a list of the Governor shall make it public. Not fewer than 28 days nor more than 56 days after delivery of the list, the Governor shall appoint therefrom one person to fill each vacancy. If any appointment is not made by the Governor within 56 days, the Commission shall immediately submit the list to the Supreme Court, which shall promptly make the appointment from the list. G) A judge appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve until the end of the unexpired term. Section 12.2. Circuit local option referendums. A) The electors of any judicial circuit may be a referendum, here designated as a local option referendum, adopt a proposition requiring Sections 12.1 and 12.3 to govern the selection of circuit judges and associate judges of that circuit. The electors of a circuit shall vote on the proposition at the next general election held not less than three months following the filing of petitions with the Secretary of State, signed by not fewer than five percent of the total number of





electors who voted at the next preceeding general election in that circuit, asking that the proposition be submitted to referendum. If a Majority of votes cast on the proposition are in the affirmative, Sections 12.1 and 12.3 shall thereafter govern the selection of circuit judges and associate judges of the circuit court of that circuit. B) After the tenth year following a local option referendum whereby the electors of a circuit have adopted Sections 12.1 and 12.3 to govern the selection of circuit judges and associate judges pursuant to this Section, the electors of the circuit may terminate their adoption of Sections 12.1 and 12.3 by a local option referendum. Such a referendum shall be subject to the same requirements and conducted in the same manner as a referendum for adoption of Sections 12.1 and 12.3. If a Majority of the votes cast on the proposition to terminate are in the affirmative, the selection of circuit judges and associate judges of that circuit shall thereafter be governed by Sections 12 and 8, respectively, unless and until Sections 12.1 and 12.3 are again adopted pursuant to this Section.

Section 12.3. Judicial Nominating Commissions. A) there shall be a Judicial Nominating Commission in each judicial district for nomination of judges for the Supreme Court and appellate court, and in each judicial circuit which, by a local option referendum, adopts Section 12.1 and this Section 12.3 for the selection of circuit judges and associate judges for that circuit. B) The Circuit Judicial Nominating Commission for each circuit except the Cook County Circuit shall consist of eleven residents of the circuit; six non-lawyers, of whom no more than three shall be Members of the same political Party, and five lawyers. The Circuit Judicial Nominating Commission for the Cook County Circuit shall consist of 31 residents of the circuit; sixteen non-lawyers, of whom no more than eight shall be Members



of the same political Party, and fifteen lawyers. C) The District Judicial Nominating Commission for each judicial district except the First Judicial District shall include four residents from each circuit in the district; two non-lawyers, who shall not be Members of the same political Party, and two lawyers. The First Judicial District Nominating Commission shall include 20 residents from the Cook County Circuit; ten non-lawyers, of whom no more than five shall be Members of the same political Party, and ten lawyers. An additional non-lawyer Member for each Judicial District Nominating Commission shall be appointed by the Governor; for the First Judicial District Commission from among the residents of the district who are not Members of the Cook County Circuit Commission; for each of the other Judicial District Commissions from among the Members of any Circuit Commission, within the district or, if there is no Circuit Commission within the district, from among the residents of the district."

Clerk Leone: "Section D. Except for the First Judicial District Nominating Commission, the District Nominating Commission Members from each circuit having a Circuit Judicial Nominating Commission...Commission shall be elected by that Circuit Commission from among its Members. For the First District, whether or not there is a Cook County Circuit Judicial Nominating Commission, and for the other districts from any circuit which does not have a Circuit Judicial Nominating Commission, the District Judicial Nominating Convention...Commission Members shall be appointed and elected in the same manner as provided for Circuit Commission Members in paragraphs (e) through (g) of this Section. E) The non-lawyer Members of each Circuit Commission shall be appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. The lawyer Members of each Circuit



Commission shall be selected by secret ballot, without political Party or other designation, by those lawyers admitted to practice in Illinois whose principal offices are in the appropriate circuit, in such manner as provided by rules which shall be adopted by the Supreme Court. F) In appointing the initial non-lawyer Members of each Circuit Commission, the Governor shall divide the appointed by lot into three groups, equal in number as near may be, and shall designate that group Members to serve for two, four, and six years respectively. The initial lawyer Members shall also be divided by lot into three groups, equal in number as near may be, in such a manner as the Supreme Court shall provide, the group Members to serve for two, four, and six years respectively. Thereafter, the terms of all Commission Members shall be six years. G) A vacancy in the Membership of a Circuit Commission shall be filled for the unexpired term or for a full term, as may be, in the manner and subject to the qualifications applicable at the time the vacancy occurs. H) For the first three years of each Judicial Nominating Commission's existence, the Governor shall designate one of the non-lawyer Members as Chairman; thereafter the Chairman shall be selected by vote of all the Members of the Commission from among its non-lawyer Members. The term of a Chairman shall be three years unless his or her remaining term as a Member of the Commission expires sooner, except that the term of the Chairman appointed by the Governor shall not extend beyond the first three years of the Commission's existence. The Chairman may vote only in case of a tie. I) Any person who holds any office under the United States, or this state, or any political subdivision, or municipal corporation, or municipality, or unit of local government of this state and receives compensation for services rendered in such office, or who holds any office or official



position in a political Party, shall be ineligible to serve on a Judicial Nominating Commission. Compensation for service in the state militia or the armed forces of the United States for such a period of time as may be determined by rule of the Supreme Court shall not be considered a disqualification. No Member of a Judicial Nominating Commission shall be nominated or appointed to judicial office while serving on the Commission and for a period of three years thereafter. A Member, having received a full term of six years on a Commission, may not be selected to serve on a Commission until the next three years. In Cook County no person may serve on more than one Judicial Nominating Commission at the same time. J) The Commissions may conduct such investigations, meetings and hearings, all of which may be secret, and employ such staff Members as may be necessary to perform their duties. Nominations shall be submitted to the Governor upon only concurrence of a Majority of all the Members of the Commission. Members of Commissions shall not receive any compensation from their services, but shall be entitled to reimbursement for necessary expenses. The General Assembly shall appropriate funds to the Supreme Court for such reimbursement and for other administrative expenses of the Commissions. If approved by the electors, this Amendment shall take effect the next day following the proclamation of the result of vote, except that, to provide time for the establishment of District Judicial Nominating conventions... Commissions vacancies occurring in the office of judge of the Supreme Court and the appellate court to and including the following June 30th, shall continue to be filled as provided in this Section 12(c), Article VI of the Constitution adopted in 1970 effective July 1, 1971; and vacancies occurring after the following June 30th shall be filled as provided herein. Adopted by the



Senate April 23, 1980 by three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. First Reading of the Constitutional Amendment. Introductions and First Reading. House Bill 3604, Davis, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3605, Getty-Leinenweber, a Bill for an Act...for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Commission for the uniformity of legislation in the United State, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3606, Mulcahey, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3607, Kelly, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Capital Development Board, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3608, Christensen, a Bill for an Act relating to hazardous waste, First Reading of the Bill. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution and the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Joint Resolution #56 Constitutional Amendment. Resolved by the Senate of the 81st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the state for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Section 8 of Article IX of the Constitution to read as follows: Article IX. Section 8. Tax sales. A) Real property shall not be sold for the non-payment of taxes or special assessments without judicial proceedings. B) (1) The right of redemption from all sales of real estate for the non-payment of taxes or special assessments, except as provided in paragraph 2 of this Subsection b, shall exist in favor of owners and persons interested



in such real estate for not less than two years following such sales. 2) The right of redemption from the sale for non-payment of taxes or special assessments of a parcel real estate which: A) is vacant non-farm real estate or (B) contains an improvement consisting of a structure or structures each of which contains seven or more residential units or (C) is commercial or industrial property; and upon which all or a part of the general taxes for each of five or more years are delinquent shall exist in favor of owners and persons interested in such real estate for not less than 90 days following such sales. C) Owners, occupants, and parties interested shall be given reasonable notice of the sale and the date of expiration of the period of redemption as the General Assembly provides by law. Schedule. This Amendment to Article IX, Section 8 of the Constitution takes effect January 1, 1981. Adopted by the Senate April 24, 1980 by three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Committee reports. Representative Capparelli, Chairman on the Committee on Executive to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 24, 1980 and reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bill 3101, House Bill 3163, Senate Bill 1441...be it...be adopted' House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment, 'do not pass' House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #10, 'do pass as amended' House Bills 1340, 2913, 3106, tabled by rule 24C House Bill 2711."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Pierce, Chairman of the Committee on Revenue to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 24, 1980 report the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bills 2858, 3193, 3402, and 3404, 'do pass as amended' House Bills 2822, 3140, 3289, 3395, 2921, 3204. Representative Kane-Mugalian, Co-chairman of State Government Organization to which the following



Bills were referred, action taken April 24, 1980 reports the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass as amended' House Bill 3425. Representative Willer, Chairman of the Committee on Human Resources, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 24, 1980 reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bills 3179, 3217, 3218, 'do pass as amended' House Bills 2220, 2793, 2997, 3214, 3215, 3216, 3219, 'do pass' Consent Calendar House Bill 3357, 'do pass as amended' Consent Calendar House Bill 2903. Representative Farley, Chairman of the Committee on Labor and Commerce to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 24, 1980 reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bill 3381. Representative Chapman, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 24, 1980 reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass as amended' House Bills 3045, 3046, 3059, and 3062. Representative McGrew, Chairman of the Committee on Higher Education to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 24, 1980 reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bill 3246, 'do pass' Short Debate Calendar House Bill 3220. Representative Jaffe, Chairman of the Committee on Judiciary I to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 24, 1980 reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bill 2854, 2880, 3466, 3467, 3468, 'do pass' Short Debate Calendar House Bill 3431. Representative VonBoeckman, Chairman of the Committee on Motor Vehicles to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 24, 1980 reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' Short Debate Calendar House Bill 3116, 3132, 'do pass as amended' Short Debate Calendar



House Bill 2990. Representative Terzich, Chairman of the Committee on Personnel and Pensions to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 24, 1980 reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bill 3142, 3196, 'do pass as amended' House Bill 1602 and 1603. House Joint Constitutional Amendments Second Reading. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #47. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 81st General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the state for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Section 5 of Article IV of the Constitution to read as follows: Article IV. The Legislature. Section 5. Sessions. The General Assembly shall convene each year on the second Wednesday of January. The General Assembly shall be a continuous Body during the term for which Members of the House of Representatives are elected. B) The Governor may convene the General Assembly or the Senate alone in a Special Session by a proclamation stating the purpose of the Sessions, but not limiting the Special Session to the consideration of any specific Bill or Bills; and not only business encompassed by such purpose, together with any impeachments or confirmation of appointments shall be transacted. Special Sessions of the General Assembly may also be convened, subject to the same restrictions, by joint proclamation of the presiding officers of both Houses, issued as provided by law. C) Sessions of each House of the General Assembly and meetings of Committees and Legislative Commissions shall be open to the public. Sessions and Committee meetings of a House may be closed to the public if two-thirds of the Members elected to that House determine that the public interest so requires;





and meetings of Joint Committees and Legislative Commissions may be so closed if two-thirds of the Members elected to each House so determine. To be continued! Read it to me again. This Amendment takes effect upon its approval by the electors of this state. Second Reading of the Constitutional Amendment."

Clerk Leone: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #43. (continued)"



HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 43  
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this resolution, a proposition to amend Sections 2, 5, 7, 8 and 11 of Article IV and Section 2 of Article VIII of the Constitution to read as follows:

ARTICLE IV

SECTION 2. LEGISLATIVE COMPOSITION

(a) One Senator shall be elected from each Legislative District. In the decade following each decennial redistricting, Senators from odd-numbered districts shall be elected for terms of six years and four years, and Senators from even-numbered districts for terms of four years and six years, respectively. Odd-numbered and even-numbered districts shall be distributed substantially equally over the State. No Senator may be elected for more than two consecutive terms. Immediately following each decennial redistricting, the General Assembly by law shall divide the legislative districts as equally as possible into three groups, Senators from one group shall be elected for terms of four years, four years and two years, Senators from the second group, for terms of four years, two years and four years, and Senators from the third group, for terms of two years, four years and four years. The legislative districts in each group shall be distributed substantially equally over the State.

(b) Three Representatives shall be elected from each Legislative District for a term of two years. Immediately following each decennial redistricting, the General Assembly by law shall divide the Legislative Districts into three groups. Representatives from one group shall be elected



for terms of four years, four years, and two years; Representatives from the second group for terms of four years, two years and four years; and Representatives from the third group, for terms of two years, four years and four years. No Representative may be elected for more than three consecutive terms. No political party shall limit its nominations to less than two candidates for Representative in any Legislative District. In elections for Representatives, including those for nomination, each elector may cast three votes for one candidate or distribute them equally among no more than three candidates. The candidates highest in votes shall be declared elected.

(c) To be eligible to serve as a member of the General Assembly, a person must be a United States citizen, at least 21 years old, and for the two years preceding his election or appointment a resident of the district which he is to represent. In the general election following a redistricting, a candidate for the General Assembly may be elected from any district which contains a part of the district in which he resided at the time of the redistricting and reelected if a resident of the new districts he represents for 18 months prior to reelection.

(d) Within thirty days after a vacancy occurs, it shall be filled by appointment as provided by law. If the vacancy is in a Senatorial office with more than twenty-eight months remaining in the term, the appointed Senator shall serve until the next general election, at which time a Senator shall be elected to serve for the remainder of the term. If the vacancy is in a Representative office or in any other Senatorial office, the appointment shall be for the remainder of the term. An appointee to fill a vacancy shall be a member of the same political party as the person he succeeds.

(e) No member of the General Assembly shall receive compensation as a public officer or employee from any other governmental entity for time during which he is in



attendance as a member of the General Assembly.

No member of the General Assembly during the term for which he was elected or appointed shall be appointed to a public office which shall have been created or the compensation for which shall have been increased by the General Assembly during that term.

#### SECTION 5. SESSIONS

(a) The General Assembly shall convene each year on the second Wednesday of January. The General Assembly shall be a continuous body during the two-year period commencing with the convening of the regular session of each odd-numbered year. However, the sessions of the General Assembly shall be limited to 60 session days, plus an additional 14 days for a veto session, in each calendar year. ~~term--for--which members-of-the-House-of-Representatives-are-elected.~~

(b) The Governor, subject to the approval of the presiding officers of both houses, may convene the General Assembly or the Senate alone in special session by a proclamation stating the purpose of the session; and only business encompassed by such purpose, together with any impeachments or confirmation of appointments shall be transacted. Special sessions of the General Assembly may also be convened by joint proclamation of the presiding officers of both houses, issued as provided by law.

(c) Sessions of each house of the General Assembly and meetings of committees, joint committees and legislative commissions shall be open to the public. Sessions and committee meetings of a house may be closed to the public if two-thirds of the members elected to that house determine that the public interest so requires; and meetings of joint committees and legislative commissions may be so closed if two-thirds of the members elected to each house so determine.

#### SECTION 7. TRANSACTION OF BUSINESS

(a) Committees of each house, joint committees of the two houses and legislative commissions may meet on days on



which the General Assembly is not in session and shall <sup>190</sup> give reasonable public notice of meetings, including a statement of subjects to be considered.

(b) Each house shall keep a journal of its proceedings and a transcript of its debates. The journal shall be published and the transcript shall be available to the public.

(c) Either house or any committee thereof as provided by law may compel by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, records and papers.

(d) Joint committees of conference, appointed to consider the differences between the Senate and House of Representatives with respect to any bill, may consider and make recommendations only in relation to those differences.

#### SECTION 8. PASSAGE OF BILLS

(a) The enacting clause of the laws of this State shall be: "Be it enacted by the People of the State of Illinois, represented in the General Assembly."

(b) The General Assembly shall enact laws only by bill. Bills may originate in either house, but may be amended or rejected by the other.

(c) No bill shall become a law without the concurrence of a majority of the members elected to each house. Final passage of a bill shall be by record vote. In the Senate at the request of two members, and in the House at the request of five members, a record vote may be taken on any other occasion. A record vote is a vote by yeas and nays entered on the journal.

(d) A bill shall be read by title on three different days in each house. A bill and each amendment thereto shall be reproduced and placed on the desk of each member before final passage. No bill which has been assigned to a committee of either house may be amended unless the amendment is approved by a majority of the members elected to the house adopting the amendment.



Bills, except bills for appropriations and for the codification, revision or rearrangement of laws, shall be confined to one subject. Appropriation bills shall be limited to the subject of appropriations.

A bill expressly amending a law shall set forth completely the sections amended.

No bill establishing a new State agency shall become law unless it provides for the expiration of such agency or law within five years from the effective date thereof.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate shall sign each bill that passes both houses to certify that the procedural requirements for passage have been met.

#### SECTION 11. COMPENSATION-AND ALLOWANCES

A member of the General Assembly shall receive a per diem allowance for those days the General Assembly is in regular session and the member is in attendance. The amount of such allowance shall be provided by law. A member shall receive no other salary or allowance for service in the General Assembly, except for reimbursement for reasonable and actual expenses incurred in connection with attendance at a special session, or at committee or commission meetings on days the General Assembly is not in session. ~~A member shall receive a salary and allowances as provided by law, but changes in the salary of a member shall not take effect during the term for which he has been elected.~~

#### ARTICLE VIII

#### SECTION 2. STATE FINANCE

(a) The Governor shall prepare and submit to the General Assembly, in each year at a time prescribed by law, a State budget for the ensuing fiscal biennium year. The budget shall set forth the estimated balance of funds available for appropriation at the beginning of the fiscal biennium year, the estimated receipts, and a plan for expenditures and obligations during the fiscal biennium year of every department, authority, public corporation and



quasi-public corporation of the State, every State college and university, and every other public agency created by the State, but not of units of local government or school districts. The budget shall also set forth the indebtedness and contingent liabilities of the State and such other information as may be required by law. Proposed expenditures shall not exceed funds estimated to be available for the fiscal biennium year as shown in the budget.

(b) The General Assembly by law shall make appropriations for all expenditures of public funds by the State. The General Assembly shall make the appropriations for approximately one-half of all the departments, authorities, public corporations and quasi-public corporations of the State, State colleges and universities, and every other public agency created by the State in odd-numbered years, and for the remaining one-half in even-numbered years, as provided by law. Appropriations for a fiscal biennium year shall not exceed funds estimated by the General Assembly to be available during that biennium year.

#### SCHEDULE

If approved by the electors of this State this amendment to Articles IV and VIII of the Constitution applies to the redistricting of 1981 and subsequent thereto, and to the nomination and election of members of the General Assembly in 1982 and thereafter. All other provisions herein take effect January 14, 1981. Second Reading of Constitutional Amendment and held on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: (Continued)



## HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 46

## CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this resolution, a proposition to amend Section 15 of Article VI of the Constitution to read as follows:

## ARTICLE VI

## THE JUDICIARY

## SECTION 15. RETIREMENT - DISCIPLINE

(a) The General Assembly may provide by law for the retirement of Judges and Associate Judges at a prescribed age. Any retired Judge or Associate Judge, with his consent, may be assigned by the Supreme Court to judicial service for which he shall receive the applicable compensation in lieu of retirement benefits. A retired Associate Judge may be assigned only as an Associate Judge.

(b) A Judicial Inquiry Board is created. The Supreme Court shall select two Circuit Judges as members and the Governor shall appoint four persons who are not lawyers and three lawyers as members of the Board. No more than two of the lawyers and two of the non-lawyers appointed by the Governor shall be members of the same political party. The terms of Board members shall be four years. A vacancy on the Board shall be filled for a full term in the manner the original appointment was made. No member may serve on the Board more than eight years.

(c) The Board shall be convened permanently, with authority to conduct investigations, receive or initiate complaints concerning a Judge or Associate Judge, and file complaints with the Courts Commission. The Board shall not file a complaint unless five members believe that a reasonable basis exists (1) to charge the Judge or Associate





Judge with willful misconduct in office, persistent failure to perform his duties, or other conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice or that brings the judicial office into disrepute, or (2) to charge that the Judge or Associate Judge is physically or mentally unable to perform his duties. All proceedings of the Board shall be confidential except the filing of a complaint with the Courts Commission and as provided in subsection (h) of this Section. The Board shall prosecute the complaint.

(d) The Board shall adopt rules governing its procedures. It shall have subpoena power and authority to appoint and direct its staff. Members of the Board who are not Judges shall receive per diem compensation and necessary expenses; members who are Judges shall receive necessary expenses only. The General Assembly by law shall appropriate funds for the operation of the Board.

(e) A Courts Commission is created consisting of one Supreme Court Judge selected by that Court, who shall be its chairman, two Appellate Court Judges selected by that Court, and two Circuit Judges selected by the Supreme Court. The Commission shall be convened permanently to hear complaints filed by the Judicial Inquiry Board. The Commission shall have authority after notice and public hearing, (1) to remove from office, suspend without pay, censure or reprimand a Judge or Associate Judge for willful misconduct in office, persistent failure to perform his duties, or other conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice or that brings the judicial office into disrepute, or (2) to suspend, with or without pay, or retire a Judge or Associate Judge who is physically or mentally unable to perform his duties.

(f) The concurrence of three members of the Commission shall be necessary for a decision. The decision of the Commission shall be final.

(g) The Commission shall adopt rules governing its procedures and shall have power to issue subpoenas. The



General Assembly shall provide by law for the expenses of the Commission.

(h) Information obtained or received by the Judicial Inquiry Board in connection with any investigation or hearing pursuant to this Section which reasonably relates to a Judge's or Associate Judge's criminal misconduct shall be furnished to the appropriate State's Attorney within 30 days of the completion or termination of any proceedings of the Board or Commission, as the case may be. Second Reading of the Constitutional Amendment and held on Second Reading. No further business, the House now stands adjourned." 11



RESOLUTION

670

CO-SPONSOR

TAYLOR  
BULLOCK  
POUNCEY  
PATRICK  
YOUNG, JR.  
BRAUN  
WHITE  
GAINES  
GOODWIN  
ALEXANDER  
E. JONES  
WILLIAMS  
DOMINIC

WHEREAS, The Manley High School Wildcats from the West Side of Chicago have been crowned state champions of Illinois AA Class basketball; and

WHEREAS, The Wildcats reached this pinnacle of sports by defeating an excellent squad from Effingham in the recent state tournament; and

WHEREAS, This victory and a season distinguished by 31 victories and only one defeat was achieved by outstanding effort on the part of a squad blessed with stand-out abilities acting as a tightly-knit unit under the direction of Coach Willie Little and the encouragement of Principal Blaine DeNye, Assistant Principals Albert Pratt, Malcolm Hemphill, the faculty, student body, parents and friends; and

WHEREAS, The Manley Wildcats' championship trophy symbolizes truly the spirit of potential cooperation by citizens of the Twentieth and Twenty-First legislative districts represented in this body; and

WHEREAS, Tribute is due to individual members of the Manley Wildcats not only for their championship, but also for their demonstration of the highest degree of teamwork and sportsmanship throughout a long season, and we salute Captain Roy Spearman, Timothy Anderson, Russell Cross, Vincent Johnson, Ronald Washington, Michael Buchanon, Vernon Jackson, Leonard Jones, William Knight, Craig Pickett, Rodell Roberson, DeWayne Rose, Michael Williams, James Yarboruth and Willie Hill; be it therefore

RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS that we officially and formally commend these outstanding young men, their coach, faculty and friends for demonstrating the highest degree of sports excellence; and be it further

RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be presented to Coach Little and his team as a lasting expression of our esteem.

## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
APRIL 24, 1980

PAGE 1

HB-0024	2ND READING	PAGE	22
HB-0447	3RD READING	PAGE	113
HB-0515	2ND READING	PAGE	23
HB-0524	CONFERENCE	PAGE	103
HB-0703	3RD READING	PAGE	84
HB-0748	3RD READING	PAGE	100
HB-0821	2ND READING	PAGE	11
HB-0830	2ND READING	PAGE	2
HB-0842	2ND READING	PAGE	2
	2ND READING	PAGE	161
HB-0929	2ND READING	PAGE	29
HB-1011	3RD READING	PAGE	127
HB-1192	3RD READING	PAGE	86
HB-1294	2ND READING	PAGE	29
HB-1371	MOTIONS	PAGE	1
HB-1384	2ND READING	PAGE	30
HB-1387	3RD READING	PAGE	90
HB-1414	2ND READING	PAGE	30
HB-1500	2ND READING	PAGE	31
HB-1566	2ND READING	PAGE	16
HB-1567	2ND READING	PAGE	17
HB-1570	2ND READING	PAGE	18
HB-1800	3RD READING	PAGE	76
HB-1801	2ND READING	PAGE	31
HB-1857	MOTIONS	PAGE	1
HB-1920	2ND READING	PAGE	52
HB-2022	3RD READING	PAGE	158
HB-2044	3RD READING	PAGE	105
HB-2104	2ND READING	PAGE	53
HB-2211	2ND READING	PAGE	21
HB-2227	2ND READING	PAGE	12
HB-2245	3RD READING	PAGE	137
HB-2272	2ND READING	PAGE	160
HB-2314	MOTIONS	PAGE	2
HB-2349	2ND READING	PAGE	59
HB-2402	MOTIONS	PAGE	1
HB-2528	2ND READING	PAGE	55
HB-2657	2ND READING	PAGE	58
HB-2860	2ND READING	PAGE	55
HB-2861	2ND READING	PAGE	56
HB-2892	2ND READING	PAGE	56
HB-2905	2ND READING	PAGE	56
HB-3002	2ND READING	PAGE	57

## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
APRIL 24, 1980

PAGE 2

HB-3003	2ND READING	PAGE	73
HB-3104	2ND READING	PAGE	58
HB-3107	2ND READING	PAGE	58
HB-3604	1ST READING	PAGE	182
HB-3605	1ST READING	PAGE	182
HB-3606	1ST READING	PAGE	182
HB-3607	1ST READING	PAGE	182
HB-3608	1ST READING	PAGE	182
SB-0860	MOTIONS	PAGE	165
SB-0942	2ND READING	PAGE	12
SB-1239	3RD READING	PAGE	109
HR-0670	3RD READING	PAGE	28
HJR-0034	MOTIONS	PAGE	2
HJR-0094	3RD READING	PAGE	165
	MOTIONS	PAGE	163
*HJR-0043	2ND READING	PAGE	186
	MOTIONS	PAGE	140
*HJR-0046	2ND READING	PAGE	193
*HJR-0047	2ND READING	PAGE	185
SJR-0001	1ST READING	PAGE	170
SJR-0016	1ST READING	PAGE	172
SJR-0025	1ST READING	PAGE	174
SJR-0056	1ST READING	PAGE	182

## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
APRIL 24, 1980

PAGE 3

## SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER LECHOWICZ - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REEREND KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
POSTING DEADLINE SUSPENSION	PAGE	54
ORDER OF CALL SUSPENSION	PAGE	74
MEMBER VOTE CHANGES	PAGE	169
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	170
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	170
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	182
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	183
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	195