

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

Krueger: "In the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, Amen. Oh, Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Let us say a special prayer for Walter and Josephine Oblinger who will be observing their 40th wedding anniversary. Lord, God, Father of all, we ask Thy blessings on Walter and Josephine this day, who observed 40 years of holy wedlock in Thy name. Bless and keep them in all prosperity and health, cheerfulness and happiness. May Thy peace be with them always. Amen. Harold Hayden wrote; 'It is wiser to choose what you say than to say what you chose.' Let us pray. Almighty Father, we are grateful for this day in our lives as we serve Thee and the peoples of the State of Illinois in this House of Representatives. Do Thou, guide our tongues with wisdom that we may offer before our fellow Legislators only that which is cogent to the issues now before us and most pertinent to effecting a satisfactory law by which the state will be governed. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Pledge of allegiance. Representative Schoeberlein."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Only your own switch. All voted who were here? Take the record. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to ask leave of the House that the Speaker be allowed to use his discretion to give first priority on the call of the Bills to those who are now in attendance



and those who he sees coming to the floor quickest because I think you watch from the Chair, those who are on the floor and they ought to have consideration. And I ask unanimous consent for that discretion."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Hearing none... Hearing none, leave is granted. Will... Will the culprit who locked the drawer up here on the podium please stand up? I give up. Please unlock the door. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 725, Harris, 727, Swanstrom-Rigney, 728, Chapman, 729, House Joint Resolution 93, Currie-Giorgi, House Joint Resolution 95, Chapman."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 25... 725 by Harris commends the square dancers of America in Illinois. 727 by Swanstrom honors 'Ma Morris'. 28 (sic) by Chapman a not-for-profit ClearBrook center house.... clear book center..... by Peoria... 7... It honors ... It honors the ClearBrook... 'Carburg Center', a private not-for-profit center located in Rolling Meadows. I gave you 729. 93, Giorgi-Currie prevails on Congress to continue the food stamp program. 95 by Chapman asks that a report on the Joint Committee on nursing care be extended from May to December. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Representative Piel, for what purpose do you arise? Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've got a question. I just talked to..... on the one you say is... Is the one naming the square dance the state dance of Illinois?"

Speaker Redmond: "Explain that Resolution, Mr. Giorgi."

Piel: " I thought it was supposed to be before Executive Committee. It was taken out of the record so..."

Giorgi: "No, I tell you.. There was a Resolution about a month ago, asking that square dance indeed be made the official dance



of the State of Illinois. We objected to that. You sent it to Committee. In this case, we're just commending the square dancers, just commending them. This is..."

Piel: "Alright. Okay. "

Giorgi: "I was very... I'm very careful about scrutinizing these Resolutions."

Piel: "Okay. I was wondering about the polka, or the Irish jig or..."

Giorgi: "If I had to read every one of them, I'd become the most knowledgeable guy in State Government.. in reading Resolutions. And I sound very clear on that one, didn't I?"

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "The House of Representative 726 by Representative Huff. In respect to the memory of Emil Jones, Sr., father of our colleague, Emil Jones, Jr."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff moves the adoption of the Death Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. The Death Resolution's adopted. What? Representative Swanstrom, we didn't take the vote Call. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I was just curious, are all Members listed as Cosponsors on the Death Resolution?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins asked leave to have all Members shown as Cosponsors on the Death Resolution. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a motion at the time at three o'clock p.m; this afternoon be the deadline for all Spring Calendar Bills according to the Calendar which was given to all Members of the House."



Speaker Redmond: "We'll put that a little bit later. "

Simms: "Would you go for 11 o'clock?"

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Second... 1294. Out of the record. 1329, Currie. Out of the record. 1444. Farley. Out of the record. 1920, Schneider. Out of the record. 2227, Reilly. Out of the record. 23... Well, I'm going to... 2341, Kane. Out of the record. 2322, Kane. Out of the record. 2823, out of the record. 2656, Steele. They're two Steele's. Any reason that can't move along, Representative Steele? There's two Committee Amendments. Is there any motion with respect to the Committee Amendments?"

Steele: "I would move those be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, they are unless we do..."

Steele: "Oh, .."

Speaker Redmond: "Alright."

Steele: "Mr. Speaker, there has been an Amendment distributed. We might adopt that."

Speaker Redmond: "2856."



Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2856. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unified Code of Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were previously adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "...with respect to Amendments 1 and 2?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, C. M. Stiehl, amends House Bill 2856 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steele."

Steele: "Yes, at the request of the Committee there was some redundant language in the original draft of the Bill, and this Amendment merely eliminates some of that redundant language and in no way affects the original intent or thrust of the Bill, and I move its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption... Representative Keane. Representative Keane."

Keane: "Mr. Speaker, is there an Amendment on this Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, there is."

Keane: "We don't have a copy of it."

Speaker Redmond: "Has it been distributed, Mr. Page? It'd be Amendment 3: Will you get an Amendment up there to Mr. Keane? The Pages indicate they've been distributed. Mr...Representative Keane. The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye'. 'Aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. Amendment 3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 2905. Anderson. Representative Anderson. 2905. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."



Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2905, a Bill for an Act to amend a Section of the Illinois Act on Aging. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 has been adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to Amendment 1?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, McClain, amends House Bill 2905 on page one, line one and five and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson, are you familiar with this Amendment? Anderson. "

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm opposed to it and I suggest you take the Bill out of the record so..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 3001. Guess that's.. We can jump over that one I suppose. 3024. Winchester on the floor? Out of the record. 3029, Vinson. Out of the record. 3072. Out of the record. 3073? Representative Hallstrom here? Want to go with that one? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3073, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Ron..."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "No Amendments from the floor? Third Reading. 3080. "

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3080, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act authorizing the School Board and Welfare Centers to sponsor community school lunch programs and free breakfast and lunch programs and authorizing and requiring free school lunch programs providing for state reimbursement. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."



Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3201."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3201, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses and distributive expenses of the State Board of Elections. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions with respect to Amendment 1?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Yourell, amends House Bill 3201 on page three, line ten and so forth.."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. 3377. Bill? Is Lee here?"

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3377...."

Speaker Redmond: "Better take this one out of the record. 3394. Take that one out of the record. Senate Bills, First Reading. Page 13. Senate Bills, First... page 13."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1484, Pullen, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making appropriations for certain state agencies. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1646, Hallstrom, a Bill for an Act amending Sections of an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Read 1981? 16... No, 1652, did you read that one? How about 1981? On the Order of House Bills Third Reading, appears House Bill 1741. Page nine. The Gentleman asks leave to return it to the Order of Second. Is that correct? Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Are there any Amendments? 1741."

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Hoffman, amends House Bill 1741 as amended by deleting the title and inserting in



lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman. Representative Hallock? Grossi, will you do two things? Go to your own chair and sit down. And Walsh, will you please sit down?"

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 deletes everything after the enacting clause in the Bill and puts in a Section of a Bill that got tied up in Conference Committee last Session over a controversy totally unrelated to this Amendment. What this Amendment does is provide that School Districts can provide special education service on site at public and private facilities. And I would move for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #3. Any discussion? The question's on the motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. On page 20, under the Order of Motions, appears House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 12, Representative Friedrich is recognized. Friedrich. Friedrich. HJRCA 12."

Friedrich: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to discharge the Committee on Executive. Senator (sic) Capparelli has agreed to it. When we got to call this there were only a few people left in Committee. We're running out of time. I've checked with Representative Madigan and Representative Ryan so I move the discharge motion."

Speaker Redmond: "You repeat your... Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the Resolution that was heard in the Executive Committee of which I am the Vice Chairman. There were Members present. The man had a hearing, as a matter of fact, under the rules of



our Committee.... Under the rules of the Executive Committee, he still has an opportunity to present his Resolution at another time. So he has not exhausted his rights in the Committee. He has been treated fairly in the Committee. And the vote in the Committee does not necessarily represent the Membership that was present. There were other Members present who did not care to vote on the measure. I think the Gentleman's remedy is to go back to the Executive Committee of which he is a Member and ask that the Resolution again be called for a vote.."

Friedrich: "I would appreciate it, Representative Beatty, if you would talk to your Chairman. I've cleared this with him and I think that..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. Representative Friedrich and I are the hyphenated principal Sponsors of this Constitutional Amendment. First occasion that we slated the Amendment for hearing, the entire... basically the entire meeting was taken up by consideration of the Chrysler Corporation legislation. Representative Friedrich and I were unable to present it then. The second time, we checked with the other Bills there. There were very few people there. Most of the Members were in the Rules Committee and Representative Friedrich is absolutely correct in the statements that he made here today."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider?"

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the Membership ought to be aware and if we could have attention of the Membership, Mr. Speaker, some attention please? This is. Thank you. This is the annual effort by a number of people, primarily again, Representative Friedrich, and I respect his opinion. However this annual effort to alter the State Superintendancy of education has had more than its generous attention over the last couple



of years. I think Representative Beatty's point was well taken that the Bill... or the Constitutional Amendment will have an opportunity to be reconsidered again is a valid one. If we leap over the Committee on this proposal, I think it's erroneous. It does indeed strike me as being an effort to kind of even up the score in many respects. I have, again, a high regard for the Sponsors, but they ought to remember that the State Board of Education in my judgment has been moving admirably away from the political ties that were so often associated with that office and what we are trying to do is put the most sensitive area of State Government, that is, education, in the hands of people that are representative across the State of Illinois and allow them to help us... to give us guidance as a Legislature. Once we take it out of that realm, I think we jeopardize education from the attitudes that we all hold I think, which is the best education for the kids of Illinois. And we put it into a political person's hands who may utilize it for purposes other than education. So I say this, one, we ought to defeat a motion to discharge the Committee, let the Committee make its decision and then face the issue as it comes before us. It won't bypass Committee. This is an annual proposal. Let's try to keep it in Committee.

That would be my preference. So, please defeat the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The previous speaker has said it well. The School Problems Commission in 1973 provided the present modus operandi following the mandate by the Constitution of 1970. In my judgment, the Board is pursuing a reasonable, logical course in terms of what you would expect the evolution of a Board of that nature to take under these circumstances. Our present State Superintendant has resigned effective July of this year.



So, for a whole variety of reasons, I think we ought to give them an opportunity to appoint a new Superintendent and give that individual an opportunity and see how it goes. I just really feel they're moving in the right direction and I don't think that this Resolution.. Constitutional Amendment is in the best interests of the boys and girls of the State of Illinois and for that reason; I would ask you to oppose this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I believe the last two Gentlemen were debating the merits of the Constitutional Amendment as opposed to debating the motion. Certainly, number one this does not assure... this package.. this motion does not assure this is going to be on the ballot. It will give it a chance to be debated on this floor. Number two, even if it's passed by both Houses and put on the ballot, it does not assure it's going to be changed. But I think that the people of this state have a right to vote on this question which they have not had a chance to do since 1970 and I think if you have faith in the people, and you may not, if you don't, you don't belong on this floor... So if you have faith in the people to govern themselves, I think you should give them a chance to make this decision and that's all we're doing here is trying to get this on the floor so we can debate it thoroughly here and then if the Body sees fit, then it will be submitted to the people and it will be subject to their will at that time. I don't know what you're afraid of, unless you're afraid the people of this Body haven't got enough sense to vote on it or the people of the State of Illinois haven't got enough sense to vote on an issue which is vital to them."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the provisions of Rule 66-A be suspended and that the Committee on.. Committee



on the Executive be discharged from further consideration to House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #12 and that it be advanced to the Order of Constitutional Amendments, Second Reading. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Kane?"

Kane: "What vote is required?"

Speaker Redmond: "89. I would caution you to vote only your own switch because it takes 89 and ... Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd urge a 'no' vote on this. Just because a Constitutional Amendment is introduced is no reason why we should bring it to the floor or that we should submit it to the voters. Changing the Constitution is something that's important and should be done only when there's a dire need for it. I think that if we put this out onto the floor, we're doing a great disservice to our own system of Committee and our own deliberative process and I would urge a 'no' vote at this time. There's absolutely no reason for it now."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Again I caution you to only vote your own switch. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, if this has 89 votes, I'm going to ask for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I would ask for a poll of the absentees. I got an early call on this and it's obvious that some of the people are still in their office. I had hoped it would be at a later time when all would be here, but I had asked you to call it, so I'm not critical of you. But I would ask for a poll of the absentees. Again, all we're asking for here is a chance to debate this on the



Hoffman: "That was the poll of the absentees. Right now, we're.

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct. And you had requested ...
to advise us of any questions you had of the Affirmative
Roll Call."

Hoffman: "You have not read the Affirmative Roll Call yet.
Is that correct? So I'm...."

Speaker Redmond: "I guess you're right. I guess you're right.
Mr. Clerk, proceed with the Call of the Affirmative Roll
Call. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, how many votes do we have?"

Speaker Redmond: "How many? 91."

Hoffman: "91. Now, I have 'x' number of people I can take
off the Roll right now without going through the Affirma-
tive Roll Call which I'm willing to do if the Sponsor
is willing to do it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich?"

Friedrich: "I tell you what I'm willing to do. I'm willing
to call this when the people are on the floor if he
wants to waive this Roll Call. That sounds like
a sporting proposition. I'll withdraw the motion
and call it when we get some people on the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I'll accept that."

Speaker Redmond: "We have leave to dump this Roll Call and take
it out of the record? Hearing no objection, it is
taken out of the record. Dump the Roll Call. Roll Call
for attendance. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Earlier this morning I
returned to Second Reading House Bill 1741 for the pur-
pose of an Amendment which I did not have an opportunity
to put on yesterday due to our getting tied up in some
other things later in the day. And for that reason,
Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the consent of the House
to suspend the appropriate rule so that Bill might be
heard on Third Reading today."



Speaker Redmond : "What Bill are we talking about here?"

Hoffman: "1741."

Speaker Redmond: "1741..."

Hoffman: "1741 and 1742 which we haven't had a chance to get to yet."

Speaker Redmond: "1741 we just returned that to the Order of Second Reading and amended it and put it back up to Third. Under Rule 35-C why you would have to stay on there for a day. Representative Hoffman has moved to suspend that rule so that 1741 can be considered today. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "The question... The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. 1741. Vote, yeah, I guess that's right. The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. It requires 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "This is a motion to do what?"

Speaker Redmond: "You're right."

Deuster: "Your usual lucid explanation."

Speaker Redmond: "This is... This is Representative Hoffman's motion to... for leave to suspend the rule which requires a Bill that's been amended to not be considered that day, but to be considered the following day. Once we've moved it back and amended it, and then put it back up to Third. He wants leave to have it voted on today as amended. Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of information, I know really I'm probably out of order on this because I'm not addressing the proper substance. But, House Amendment #1.. says.. refers to having a population of less than 500,000... But the original Bill deals with the city of Chicago. Now surely, the Board of Education deals with more people than a half a million. Is that



in conflict..."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think so because the motion... er, the Amendment struck everything after the enacting clause and I think the Section that you're referring to is after the enacting clause. So I think that's out."

Van Dyne: "So, then, really, the Digest is very misleading. We're not dealing with the city of Chicago at all."

Speaker Redmond: "No. Representative Hoffman, I'd better let you get into this. "

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a motion to suspend the rule to allow me to hear an Amendment which was on your desk yesterday to this particular Bill that due to the time constraints which we had yesterday, as we took up a number of other items that other Legislators wanted to take up, I was not able to back this Bill down yesterday and put this Amendment in. This Amendment does not... We took everything out of the Bill and this provides one simple Section out of a Senate Bill 1000 that got tied up in a Conference Committee on something totally unrelated to this on a controversial issue. So all I'm asking for is permission to hear the Bill on Third Reading today and I'll be happy to explain the Amendment to you at the appropriate time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "In explaining my vote, Mr. Speaker, I would think tomorrow would be a good day to call this in view of Mr. Hoffman's reluctance getting more stuff on the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 93 'aye's, and two 'no' and the motion failed. Page seven, on the Order of House Bills, Third Reading. Page seven, appears House Bill 821. Representative Younge."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 821, a Bill for an Amen... an Act to



amend the Industrial Development Act and the powers of the Department of Business and Economic Development.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

This Bill would amend the powers of the Illinois Industrial Development Authority to give them the power to develop industrial parks. As the Bill... the Bill originally started out to issue general obligation bonds. The last Amendment is now the Bill and it does not have anything to do with general obligation bonds. The provision of the Bill at this time is merely to expand the authority of the Illinois Housing Develop... the Illinois Industrial Development Authority to give them the capacity to work with industrial projects which shall mean industrial parks. And I move for the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion?"

Younge: "This is a power that the Illinois Industrial Development Authority wants. I move for the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Chair, how many votes is required on this Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's been amended. Is it Piel or 'Pel'?"

Piel: "Piel, Karpel. 'One 'Kar'; two 'Piel's!'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge, are those general obligation bonds?"

Younge: "No, the provision in reference to general obligation bonds has been... has been deleted from the Bill. All the Bill does at this time is give the Illinois Industrial Development Authority the power to bill industrial districts. Right now, they're limited to a specific application for a specific bill on a specific piece of



floor. I think it's a vital issue and I appreciate..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 90 'aye's and 43 'no'. Representative Robbins, for what purpose do you arise?"

Robbins: "I just wanted to explain my vote on this Bill. I feel like the people of the State of Illinois have the right to say whether they want to continue an appointed Superintendent of Schools or whether they would have an elected Superintendent of Schools, I feel like we should give them this opportunity. I like the judgment of the people, whether they choose me or not, better than I do appointing people."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Friedrich has requested a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk. Representative Friedrich. Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees; Abramson. Beatty. Bluthardt. Bowman. Breslin. Bullock. Conti. DiPrima. Donovan. John Dunn. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewell. Gaines. Griesheimer. Hudson. Huff. Johnson. Emil Jones. Karpziel. Klosak. Leverenz. Mautino. McAuliffe. McBroom. McGrew...."

Speaker Redmond: "Direct remarks to the Chair."

Clerk Leone: "Meyer. Neff. Oblinger. Excuse me, O'Brien. Peters. Piel. Schlickman. Skinner. Stanley. Stearney. Taylor. Telcser. Williamson. J.J. Wolf. Sam Wolf. Yourell. And, Mr. Speaker. "

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Hoffman, any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call? Representative George Ray Hudson, for what purpose do you arise?"

Hudson: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

Hudson: "Vote me 'aye', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Old friend. Representative Hoffman."



land. And this Bill as presently amended would give them the authority to be concerned with the development of industrial parks. The provision having to do with two million dollars of general obligation bonds or any other bond has been taken out of the Bill."

Piel: "Yes, the specific purpose was to declare three-fifths, right?"

Younge: "No, it would be a simple Majority. It has to do with merely broadening the authority of the Illinois Industrial Development Authority. Has got nothing to do with bonding."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian has to check with the statutes. Perhaps it might be advisable to take this out until they come back with the answer. That alright with you, Representative Younge? Okay. Take it out of the record temporarily. 1992. 1952, Representative Steele, page ten."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1952, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steele."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1952 authorizes the Department of Transportation to lease out under certain conditions lands on state highway right-of-way. This is actually a clarifying piece of legislation that clears up what is already being done and what is already been done under implied authority. So it's a clarifying piece of legislation. One Amendment's been added requiring that fair market value be included in the legislation. It's supported by the Department of Transportation. It passed the Committee by 17 to three and I would urge your favorable approval."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Representative Steele, as you well know, there was a . . ."



certain amount of confusion about this Bill the other day as to the specific ingredients that go into these leases. Now we're not talking about a helicopter port, air rights for B-25's over 55 median strip. You never did explain it and there was a specific request, at least for myself, and others that you do say what the ingredients are in these leases."

Steele: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Van Duyne. The legislation specifies that right-of-ways may be leased including air rights. And at the present time there are no air rights leased and the only right-of-ways being utilized, Representative Van Duyne, are for parks and for parking lots. They're all in the Chicago area. They bring in about half a million dollars a year and if the legislation's not passed, why, then the revenues lost plus the parks and the parking lots which are really for public uses, and of course, that's why you have public property, is for public usage, that would be lost. Built into it is the competitive bids, the fair market value, leases can't be over five years. It's a very desirable piece of legislation, one that has worked well in the past and I think that that pretty well encompasses the question you have and from your indication that satisfies the question you had. And I do move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Ready for the question? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 'aye's, and no 'nay'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mulcahey, 'aye'. 349. On House Bills, Third Reading appears on page ... I'm taking them in the order in which the people were here at the time we came in here. Where in the world is 349? 842. I don't know where 349, so we'll ... It was on



Postponed Consideration. Well, let's go to that one later. 842. Representative Greiman."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 842, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 842 was the subject of Amendment ... of our Amendment process yesterday. It was the subject of some significant Amendments last year, Amendments that were very restrictive. Yesterday, those Amendments were taken off the Bill. And Amendments that we believe that everyone in this House should be able to live with were placed on the Bill. Mr. Vinson placed an Amendment on which the Sponsors accept and I would ask Mr. Vinson to close the debate after I finish. Basically the Bill provides for the Vinson 'Sunshine provisions' with respect to the Commerce Commission as well as a provision that allows for one year, only for next winter, a prohibition against winter shut-offs. But the prohibition is different than the one that was experimentally used by the Commerce Commission this year. Under the present... Under the offered Section, winter shut-offs would be prohibited by the heating utility companies only.. only where the customer went in and worked out and signed up a deferred payment. Yesterday, I had a question that was asked me about that and I noticed that there was a grammatical error and we changed that so that there must be, there must be a signed deferred payment, must be a signed deferred payment before you can allow a winter... a prohibition on winter shut-offs. It is a.. I don't have to tell anybody. The trauma, the tragedy of shutting off the heating plant of anybody in the middle of December. The figures are that this was tried this winter. It was by no means disastrous. The .. The numbers of receivables did go up, but we are in dif-



ferent and difficult economic times. I present to you also that this is a mere one year statute. It does not go beyond that. It applies only to the next winter. It is a... It is a concept which is being used in other states. It is one that we have used by our Commerce Commission this year and I would recommend it to your approval and ask for an 'aye' vote on House Bill 842."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, contrary to what the Sponsor says, they did clean up some 'and's and or's' in the Amendment, but this is still a very bad Bill. I'd like the Membership to look at this Bill. It requires electric and gas companies that provide services regardless of payment of utility bills to all customers from December first to April first, who use electric or gas only in source of space heating. That means the biggest energy using customer of the utility. Though the Amendment appears to be to require the customer to enter into a deferred payment agreement, the cut-off moratorium has nothing to do with any payments being made. Greiman's Amendment defines customer so broadly that any household could easily qualify for free winter services. After this year's cut-off moratorium every Illinois utility has large amounts of uncollectable receivables for energies provided to those who can afford their pay... to pay their bills. Last year, 47 million dollars were provided to Illinois to pay utilities of the poor and elderly by the Federal Government. In addition, the House Revenue Committee recommended a 'Do pass' on House Bill 3204, which contains Representative Sharp's proposal for state payments to senior citizens for their utility expenses. This year's cut-off ordered by the Commerce Commission in response



to a House Resolution still needs to be studied. See its actual cost to all the rate payers. This data will not be available for at least another month and the results may be questionable because of the mild winter. The Commission is prepared to... is to prepare a report for the General Assembly and until we receive that report, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask you to take a good look at this Bill and defeat it."

Speaker Redmond : "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I very rarely get up and speak against a Member's Bill unless I think it is a bad Bill. This not only is a bad Bill, it got worse with the Amendment. I don't think we've got any business forcing upon the people of this state such legislation as this. It does not do anything for the poor people as is suggested. It does the same thing for all the people. I'll guarantee you, they'll be one hell of a lot of people that won't pay their bills even though they're able to pay them if the Bill passes into law. And I would ask... urge everyone to vote 'no', or at least not vote green."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

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

Greiman: "Yup."

Anderson: "Is this exactly the same as what we experimented with this year? Is there any change at all?"

Greiman: "Yes, as a matter of fact, it's more restrictive than the Commerce Commission's experiments. Cause it doesn't have in it the temperature so that it's restrictive. We have used it this past year. The utilities are still in business. They're still available. The 47 million dollars is still available whether this is used or not. And it doesn't make any difference. It doesn't change it at all. "

Anderson: "It's then, in fact, the exact same thing that we



experimented with this year?"

Greiman: "It would be... Well, there are differences.."

Anderson: "Well, can you enumerate..."

Greiman: "Differences that as my recollection is, there's no... there is no absolute prohibition based on temperature in the Bill. There was an absolute prohibition on .. in the Commerce Commission's experiment that when the temperature was at a certain level, you couldn't go below that. So there is that difference. Actually this is more beneficial and easier for the utilities to handle than that was because they claimed that they were running back and forth on temperature. This Bill doesn't have that. So in that sense, this is more restrictive and easier for the utility companies to live with than the experimental program of the utili.. of the Commerce Commission."

Anderson: "Well, as I remember, the program that's in force this year, if you went in and signed up for a level payment plan, you were allowed to continue. However, if the temperature went up above 32 or something.."

Greiman: "Right..."

Anderson: "They could shut you off. Now can they still shut you off if the temperature goes above 32?"

Greiman: "Absolutely, or even under as a matter of fact..."

Anderson: "Alright..."

Greiman: "...that's not on there...."

Anderson: "So you must sign up for the level payment program."

Greiman: "Oh, absolutely. It's tied up to a deferred payment program. You must... In order to avail yourself of this, you must tie in to a deferred payment program. It is an absolute must."

Anderson: "Well, I think this sounds like a good Bill and I'm going to support it."

Greiman: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."



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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Greiman: "I will."

Huff: "Well, Mr. Greiman, what's the effect of the Vinson Amendment on this Bill?"

Greiman: "Well, that's an effort to provide the Commission with certain rights and provide people who are appearing before the Commission certain rights. For example, to use the normal Civil Practice Act, rules of discovery so that one has access to the files and the records and what not of parties who are before the Commission. It also provides for some intervention rules. That's basically what it does. But Mr. Vinson is, of course, better able to explain it than I."

Huff: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I was just signaling to get your attention to close on it. If other people want to talk on it first, why don't you permit that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I assume that Amendment #5 is still on this legislation. Amendment #5 is the Vinson legislation which.."

Greiman: "Yes, it is still on."

Bradley: "Well, I'd like to call the attention of the House to what Amendment #5 does and I hate to be opposing my colleague from the 44th District, but Amendment #5 creates a quasi-judicial Body known as the 'Illinois Commerce Commission' which we already have but on page two, the annual salary of each Commissioner will be \$35,200 which is a... Then it goes up to 37,300 in '80 and 39,000 thereafter and then the Chairman receives an additional 8500 per year for chairing it and there are many changes in there. On page six, I think is the guts of the Amendment that we're giving the Commission



some additional privileges here. It says, they shall adopt rules and regulations establishing standards which a public utility shall follow in responding to a customer inquiry about service, instrumentality, equipment, facilities, rates and charges of a public utility. In no case shall a Commission impose rules and regulations which unfairly disadvantage a public utility initiating direct sales contact. It's... It's an Amendment that I think was a.. actually a Bill that was defeated last year, if I'm not.... If I'm not mistaken and I wonder maybe if Representative Vinson might respond to the question that if he would define what a quasi-judicial body is as mentioned on page one, Section I of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative... Just a minute. Representative Polk, are you seeking recognition?"

Polk: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Eighty-First General Assembly is extremely fortunate today to have in their gallery sitting up here on the right, from 'Hawthorn-Irving School' in Rock Island, one of our outstanding grade schools as represented here by Representative Darrow, Representative Bell and myself. If my student friends would stand up, I'd appreciate it very much if they can be recognized."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson to respond to the inquiry."

Bradley: "Well, thank you very much, Ben we appreciate the interruption but.. Sam, in..."

Vinson: "Was it Polk or Taylor that introduced that group?"

Bradley: "Also respond to what it is and how it differs from what we presently have."

Vinson: "You're speaking in terms of the quasi-judicial language Representative?"

Bradley: "Yes."

Vinson: "What we have with that language and what I think the



effect of it is, is to emphasize the fact that we are dealing with an agency for which judicial standards are appropriate, that it's important because of the fact that it is in dealing with adversary situations and that it's adjudicating important rights to make it and to treat it more like a judicial agency than an administrative agency. And that's the purpose of that particular language and the purpose of a number of the changes. It's to attach the judicial nature of the proceedings to the proceedings."

Bradley: "Was this... One other question, Representative Vinson. Was this at one time a Bill that you introduced and was.. what happened to that Bill if it was a Bill?"

Vinson: "Well, twice I've introduced this as a Bill. In 1978 shortly after I was appointed to the Legislature, in conjunction with Senator 'Bloom', I sponsored this legislation and picked it up when it came... when he passed it in the Senate and it was not approved by the House Public Utility Committee. Again in 1979 I introduced it and it was never heard in the Public Utility Committee in that.. in that year."

Bradley: "Well, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think this is something that we can do without and we don't need. I hate... I'm sorry that it's a part of Representative Greiman's Bill, who I might be able to support, but with this Amendment attached to it, I'm going to oppose it and urge the Members to take a good strong look at Amendment #5 that's on House Bill 842. We're passing legislation that was defeated prior to today and now it's coming back to us again in the form of an Amendment. I urge the defeat of House Bill 842 in its present condition."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know all of you want to lower the rates or have less cost for the utilities for every-



one. But do you know that it is Bills such as this that are not lowering the rates? They are going to raise them. You cannot put people where they do not have to pay utility bills, yes, the payment plan and all of this. But it does not help. Someone has to pay for the cost of the delay in payment for the money that is used. Last year \$47 million dollars was provided to Illinois to pay for those utilities of the poor and the needy and the elderly by the Federal Government. And we also have a Bill that is passed this House that is Representative Sharp's and it is also for state payments on top of federal payments for the people who are in need. Anyone can qualify in this situation. It is wrong. It will raise rates. It will not lower them. You are just penalizing again the people that pay their bills and this will be more costly to them. I urge you to vote 'no' on 842."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Greiman to close."

Greiman : "Well, I had suggested that Mr. Vinson would close, but I would just.. because the subjects are somewhat disjointed, I'd like to just make a comment and then turn it over to Mr. Vinson if I might. Some of the comments have been that this will raise the rates. That is not true. If the 47 million dollars and the Sharp Bill are available, then we'll use them and we'll use them to pay the utilities so that there will be no loss of income. On the other hand, if they are not available, if the money is not forthcoming from those two sources, then people will find themselves in mid-winter without heat. We have some overriding concerns, some overriding considerations that I think we must... we must think about and we must touch. And we must resolve. As far as the whether... the Vinson Amendment is appropriate on this Bill or not, it's on



there. I accept it with the will of this House and I accept the will of this House and so I proceeded this morning with that on. Obviously the Bill is not going to be signed into law later on this afternoon. If it passes, it'll have to go through the Senate and I suspect the veto process of the Governor so there's plenty of time to take off my end of it or Mr. Vinson's end of it. I would ask, therefore, that... pass this Bill out so that winter shut-offs are kept alive and fight the other battles in the Senate when.. at the appropriate time. But pass... I would now yield to Mr. Vinson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I will not address the winter shut-off portion of the Bill. Representative Greiman has done that. I will address Amendment #5 and the general question of utility regulation which it deals with. What we do when we create the Illinois Commerce Commission and what we do when we deal with regulatory law, is to regulate monopoly. We grant them and accord them a monopoly, an exemption from the normal competitive business process. It's appropriate when we do that that we have reasonable and fair regulation to insure that the monopoly does not take advantage of its position in order to inflict unfair disadvantage onto the consumer. What the Amendment.. What Amendment #5 does is to make a series of important and I would argue comprehensive changes in the Public Utility Act which will assure that in fact we do have fair and ... fair and regulation of utilities and protection for consumers. I think Members of this House know from my past record that I am not an anti-utility Legislator. I have not cast votes in the past on a number of things that have been regarded as pro-consumer or anti-utility. And I don't think I do that in this instance. I think I



cast a vote. I think I offer an Amendment that is a fair and balanced Amendment on both sides. What does that Amendment do? It applies ethic standards to the hearing examiners who in fact make most of the decisions on rate cases. Is that improper? Should they not be subjected to ethic standards? I submit they should be. It applies civil practice rules on intervention and discovery. Now, in fact, those particular rules will operate to the advantage of the regulated utilities. They will give them a slightly better situation on intervention and discovery than they now have under Commission rules. They'll give them precisely the same situation you would have in a Circuit Court in the State of Illinois and I think that's fair. We require the Commission to adopt consumer service standards on customer inquiries. Now I think it's fair that consumers of public utilities services in this state should know that there are standards, specified standards, the utilities have to adhere to in responding to consumer complaints. We give that utility a monopoly and we simply say here are a set of reasonable standards resulting after public hearings and after thorough investigation by the Commission which the utility has to respond to. What else do we do? We provide that the Commerce Commission can make an order asking for a management audit of a poorly run utility. We all know that there's good utilities and there's bad utilities. And when we have a bad utility, that's overcharging or under serving the consumer, ought we not to be able to have a management audit that looks at that utility and before we give them a rate increase, says how can we improve their performance? I think we should. Now, much will be made of a provision in this Amendment which deals with advertising. One thing this Amendment does not do is prohibit any advertising. One thing it does do is to say to the Commerce Commission



that you can't authorize a utility to engage in advertising which is not in the interest of the consumer and to charge the consumer for it. They can still do it but they have to charge it to stockholder funds, not to the consumer. Why should the consumer have to pay in fact for advertising when he derives no benefit from it? I think that provision's fair. Finally, it abolishes the Secretary of the Commission and I think that if you look at the history of the Illinois Commerce Commission, you know there's no justification for having a secretary. It's a patronage plum. The secretary in the best of years simply gets in fights with the Chairman about who's supposed to run the Commission. We're trying to save the taxpayers a little money here, provide for a more efficient operation of these Commissions and to abolish another patronage plum. I think that this Bill is a balanced Bill. It's designed to help the rate payer but not to hurt the utility. I think it puts both on a fair footing and I think it's an appropriate response to a situation where you grant a big business operation a monopoly and when they're excluded from having to compete with other people in the business process. I would urge you to vote 'aye', not to vote for utilities, not to vote against utilities, but to vote for fair and open utility regulation. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'

Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, some of you may not realize that oftentimes legislation such as this can be considered as labor legislation. We just went through a long strike of International Harvester, four months, and during that strike the local power company could not terminate



the utilities of the fellows who were out on strike. As soon as the April 1st deadline passed their utilities began to be shut-off. As long as we can use means such as this and such as food stamps, the unions can go out on strike and stay out longer. So those who have an interest in organized labor I'm sure would be supporting this Bill and of course, those who are opposed to such things would be against the Bill. It's obvious that this Bill's not going anywhere today and I'm sure that the speaker will reintroduce it again next year."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 47 'aye's and 72 'no'. The Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. 971. Greiman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 971, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Well, We'll try... That may be the way to do it, cut off my mic. 971 is an Amendment to the Condominium Property Act. At the present time the Condominium Act requires that a converter from an apartment leasing arrangement to a condominium arrangement when the conversion takes place, the converter must give all of the documents of the systems and all of the bylaws, the declaration, the projected budget, the floor plan, and all of the other things that the tenant is supposed to have to make up his or her mind as to whether they want to purchase. But it doesn't provide access to the building's physical plant, access to the system. House Bill 971 allows the tenants who are being given the opportunity to purchase and in essence, who are being told, purchase or lease, the opportunity to have access to inspect the building and its systems and the documents that would pertain to those systems that the owner had.



It's a reasonable request and I would ask that we give meaning to the other requirements because if we say that you have to give a lot of papers but don't allow anyone to go behind the papers to actually look at the physical plant, we're really giving an empty right. It isn't put in to.. for stall or to delay condominium conversion necessarily. It merely gives people who are faced with the obligation to buy their apartment the right to make an informed judgment and I would ask for your approval of House Bill 971."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Ebbesen 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 105 'aye' and... ten 'no' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2104, Schneider. It's on page ten."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. 2104 develops language which conforms pretty much to what that 'ISSC' had which gives students all the privileges of that Membership of the Board of Higher Education. What it intends to do, of course, is to try to have some input that is significant and meaningful and with this single Member, what you'll discover of course is that it will be essentially that. The make-up of the Board is substantial enough it does not dilute the Board at all, but rather continues an ongoing experience and tradition that has been very valid, allowing students to participate on the Board of Higher Education. I would solicit an 'aye' vote for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion?"

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2104, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act and other related Acts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "All those in favor of this Bill vote 'aye'."



Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor would yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Dunn: "... He is a voting Member on the Board of Higher..."

Schneider: "Yes, that's right."

Dunn: "This Bill went through Higher Education Committee and..."

Schneider: "Yes, it did."

Dunn: "And passed out I suppose."

Schneider: "That's correct."

Dunn: "How many Members are there on the Board?"

Schneider: "The Board has 16 Members."

Dunn: "And one of these would be a college student?"

Schneider: "That's right."

Dunn: "One of them would be a faculty Member?"

Schneider: "Appointed by the Governor of the State of Illinois."

Dunn: "Would any of them require to be a faculty Member?"

Schneider: "Half the Members have ongoing partnership and participation in the program. They have a special interest that relates more to finances and not so much to the program."

Dunn: "Would this not be a forerunner? Maybe we pass a Bill saying that other people would have to have besides just the student...."

Schneider: "Well, that would be a decision I would not support. Maybe you could offer that, Ralph."

Dunn: "I would not support it either and I don't really support this. I think this is a bad precedent, one that I've been before several times I think. It seems like this year up to now we've only had Bills that have been defeated before pretty near and they're back again as the Bill, two or three we've had this morning. I would urge we look at this Bill considerable before we vote for it and I would urge its defeat. Thank you. "

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."



Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, all I have to say is it's putting the Second Lieutenant in charge of the Third Army. It's ridiculous."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, maybe sometimes it's better to have the Second Lieutenant in charge. I've met a few of them that knew what the hell they were doing. Apparently somebody didn't know what was happening last night in a foreign country. It appears that with the circumstances that we had yesterday that it concerns me even more in relation to which way this country is going. I think in terms that the Congress today is still talking about the appropriations for the draft. It's apparent to me that my 19 year old son will be registering real soon and my daughter who was down here two days ago says she's not opposed to registering either. She said if her brother should go, she sees no reason she shouldn't. They're both... My son is in the University of Nebraska. My daughter's prepared to go to school next year. I think she's as competent as many people sitting on this Board to make some decisions in regard to her future. There are 16 people going to serve on that Board and I don't think that her .. her attitude would water down that decision at all and I think with the situation in this country today, it's time we continue to give some of these young people an opportunity to participate and I'm certainly going to support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted...? Oops. Any further discussion? Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, may I ask a question? Does the Governor right now have the opportunity to appoint on this Board Members who are attending universities now?"

Schneider: "No, they just have that procedure for... well, it



varies from the State, you know,.. Illinois elect... as you know, the University of Illinois and then the procedure is different for the other regions...."

Ropp: "You mean he can't appoint them right now if he wants to, someone who is..."

Schneider: "There is a procedure. I'm not familiar with that, to be candid with you, on other Members of the Board of Trustees for example. I'm not sure of that. All we're saying at this point is that student organization various types that now do it for the 'ISSC', could do it for this Board with the Governor's approval. "

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Walsh: "Does this Bill with all of its Amendments still provide that there shall be one Member who is a President of a private college?"

Schneider: "No, it does not. It provides for input from that group, or the students, again, with the Governor's approval."

Walsh: "It provides for what? For input from..."

Schneider: "That organization is the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges has a say in the appointment."

Walsh: "Of the student? In what sense do they have a say in the appointment..."

Schneider: "In the Amendment if you... Amendment 4, Representative, that was adopted yesterday."

Walsh: "And that Amendment simply.... Is that Amendment the Bill? I haven't .. I haven't seen that Amendment. And the Amendment is that ... And if there is an additional Member on the Board and that that Member is a student?"

Schneider: "That's right."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill has had indeed a checkered career. The most significant thing it did along the line was provide that



Board of Higher Education shall have among its Members the President of a private college and I think that's entirely reasonable. There is entirely too much control it seems to me of the Board by the state universities. Now I suggest to you what the Bill wound up doing is absolutely ridiculous and it's about time we took a close look at this. For a student to be a Member of a policy making Board that makes policy with respect to education if we think about it, is absurd and as someone mentioned a little earlier, it's certainly putting the fox in charge of the hen house. I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that we take a long look at this and we think of, those of us who are running for reelection, we think of our impending reelection and think of what our opponents might do if they ever got wind of the fact that we voted for anything as ridiculous as this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As one might suspect, the previous speaker doesn't think that anyone has intelligence to make decisions until he's age at least 50. And he has been able to make his own decisions for many years now. What we are actually doing is allowing the students to have total input. When we are trying to decided how much we're going to raise tuition, who knows better how that will affect their respective budgets than Members of that student body that would have to pay it? The student body would only have one representative on each of the Boards. I submit to you that that's certainly a long way from controlling the entire direction of each and every one of these bodies. It's a problem. It's been something that we've been moving towards for a long time. I suggest to you that we do provide some emancipation for the college students and solicit an 'aye' vote on House Bill 2104."



Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Schneider to close. Wait a minute. Representative Willer, pardon me."

Willer : "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman from Cook County who compared to this to the likes of putting the fox in charge of the chicken coop always baffled me in his attitude toward young people. I don't know if it's in spite of or because he's had quite a few himself. To say that one person out of 16 is going to control anything is ridiculous. I hope everybody listened to Representative Polk's speech. It was by far the best speech we've had about this particular Bill and I think he's absolutely right. I heartily support the concept."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birkinbine."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Birkinbine: "Mr. Schneider, am I right that the Boards of these universities would now have about 10 or 11 people on them?"

Schneider: "This is only the Board of Higher Education. All that other ... All the other references in your synopsis have been deleted. The only thing that remains is that a student will become a Member of the Board of Higher Education by appointment of the Governor."

Birkinbine: "Okay. How many are on that Board?"

Schneider: "Sixteen is the number."

Birkinbine: "Sixteen, so this would raise it to seventeen."

Schneider: "No, that would be 16."

Birkinbine: "Sixteen anyway. Okay, and so you'd have one out of 16 would be a student."

Schneider: "That's right."

Birkinbine: "Well, now if we were to extrapolate that and say, we, here in the Illinois Legislature, are making decisions



affecting the financial well-being of schools and the way some of these schools are going to be run, why not have students appointed by the Governor to sit in as full voting Members of the Legislature? "

Schneider: "Well, we don't extrapolate it that way..."

Birkinbine: "No,..."

Schneider: "Because, I mean, you can extrapolate that the Governor shouldn't appoint and eliminate the Board of Higher Ed. Now if you want to do that, again, that's another kind of an argument that operates in a vacuum. You know that the process in many ways is diverse. You have cumulative voting. You have single Member districts. You have the election of a President and a Governor. Those are arguments that are offered in a vacuum and either you add a Member to the House or you eliminate the House. You either add a Member to the Board or you eliminate the Board with that kind of extrapolation. So I don't operate from the same premise. I operate from the notion that those are functioning Boards. Students are functioning in the school system. This is their interest that's at stake, that is, education. They don't have any input that's significant. This does not dilute the Board. What it does is to give them a chance to express their interest. I don't see that as threatening unless you fear so much for the Democratic process on the Board of Higher Education that one student is going to be so dramatically persuasive as to turn the vote around. What's the argument?"

Birkinbine: "I don't fear the Democratic process by any means. But I would contend that saying adding a voice such as that to the Board would be the equivalent of adding ten such voices or 11 such voices here in the Illinois Legislature because just as that Board would be affecting the interests of the college students, hopefully, what



we are doing here is also affecting their interest. And I think the kind of thinking that says the Board is going to benefit and the students will benefit by having one voice added, that of a student, to their Board is just as silly as saying the state and the students will benefit if we stick 10 or 11 of them here because..."

Schneider: "That's the kind of logic that turns around a dark corner and runs straight into a wall. If you argue from the premise, live with it. But I can't believe you offer that kind of premise.... Looking for a defensive argument it would seem to me you've got to say that the person represents a threat to the process or to the program or to education. I would argue differently. You've got to have a position from which a student says, these are the kinds of things that are of interest to us. I want to bring it forward to you. I think you can deal with it because you are mature, understanding, educational people who have an interest and will listen to me. It's not a threat. They're not putting them up against a wall. You're not saying do this or else. The person is like you or I, that is, we offer ideas, up or down."

Birkinbine: "Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to the Bill, I disagree with the proponent of the Bill. The same way that students may indeed now be left off that Board, so are their parents and since they're usually two parents for every student, why don't we now add two parents as well as one student to the Board so the parents' interests can be heard? I would suggest to you that what we need on this Board are people who have background, people who have some degree of experience and intelligence. And the college student does not necessarily have that. The reason the college student is in college is to gain such learning, to gain such experience. I think the idea is foolish and I recommend that everybody send it where it should go and that is down."



Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'

Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. In response to one of the previous speakers, I can think of no group of people that has greater experience on what it is like to be college student than indeed does a college student. I can think of no group of people that have greater experience in knowing what programs are most needed at the college level than indeed do students at the college level. I can think of no group of people that know what programs currently offered are no longer needed, are out-dated, out-moded or not effectively presented than do the recipients of those programs, the college student. More so than people in the General Assembly do we need on these college boards at least one representative from the group that is to benefit from all these many programs and that is the students themselves. And I very avidly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to make two points. First, someone said that you have to keep in mind what people are going to think of you when they vote in the fall, I think everybody knows that lots more students are registering these days and they might be very interested in how we vote on this Bill. But I also wanted to comment on what seems to be a pervading notion that college students are young and inexperienced. As I think many of you will recall if you stop and think about it, the average age of college and university students is rising and many, many people who are in college now-a-days are older than many of us here and have more experience than many of us here, if it's possible, perhaps even older than the distinguished Gentleman from Decatur who spoke in opposition."



Speaker Redmond : "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In supporting the final legislative proposal I would just like to indicate you know that at the federal level all over this country at the age of 18 you know we have.... legally allow 18 year olds, not just necessarily students, but 18 year olds to vote and enter into contracts, get married and so forth and in some states, at the age of 18 they can make a decision as to whether they want to take a drink or not and we used to allow 19 year olds to drink and what's wrong with letting a student have a voice on a Board in which it's going to affect his education and the very future of his livelihood? And I think it's a step in the right direction and I think that this should be true in every institution of higher learning... we should have this type of representation. I would encourage everyone to... those who are on red to get over on the green side and give this the necessary votes to send it over to the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Katz."

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that this Bill will be a pioneering Bill in bringing about something that has needed to be done for a long time. We have a wonderful system of private education in Illinois. We have lots of excellent private schools and they have really not had the opportunity to participate in the deliberation of the State of Illinois, the opportunity that they should have had. And Amendment #3 to House Bill 2104, the Bill we're now on, provides that the Governor shall appoint to the Board of Higher Education a President of an Illinois private college or university. That will be an historic step. So that not only do we have the question of young people who are



participating in school who we urge to take steps to participate; and this is what this Bill permits them to do, we also have an historic opportunity to let the private colleges in Illinois participate in the important decisions relating to public higher education and I do urge that this excellent Bill with that fine Amendment be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as I remember what the prior speaker said, he suggested it was something else in this Bill. There's only one thing that this Bill does and that's to add a student. It is only because I believe that this Bill is so unnecessary and so ridiculous that I would like to be recognized to request a verification after the vote is taken."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, yes, to elaborate on the point that Representative Deuster made. Representative Katz is incorrect. If you'll recall..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew?.. Representative McGrew objects. He said that you spoke in debate. Is that correct, Mr. Walsh?"

McGrew: "Have order, Speaker. That is accurate, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "He spoke in debate."

Walsh: "Yeah, I'm raising a point, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the point?"

Walsh: "Well, the point is that .."

Speaker Redmond: "You've been mentioned in debate?"

Walsh: "Well, that's.. that's something that happened also on a couple of occasions, yes. But I won't address myself to that just now. What happened, Mr. Speaker, was that Mr. Katz understood that Amendment #3 and the provisions therein remain in the Bill. They do not. Those provisions, I agree with him, were good that a private college..."



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

McGrew: "I submit again, the Gentleman spoke in debate. He is debating the Bill. He has not addressed any point of order. "

Speaker Redmond: "I guess you're right..."

Walsh: "Would you suggest that Mr. McGrew get back to his card game, Mr. Speaker, and we get on with our business?"

Speaker Redmond: "He does ask a pertinent question."

Walsh: "Are we ready, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah. You've got about one minute to... address a point of order."

Walsh: "Yeah, the point is that Mr. Katz very eloquently explained what the Bill did not do. And if it did that, it would certainly be a far better Bill, but the fact of a student being a Member of the Board and determining tuitions, determining other policy matters is absolutely wrong. And I reiterate that this Bill, as it stands now and we're voting on it, has nothing to do with placing a private college President on the Board of Higher Education."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 98 'aye' and 62 'no'. Representative Deuster has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Mr. Schneider has requested a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees please. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, my name was mentioned in debate and I just want to say that I discovered which I did not know that a subsequent Amendment was added, Amendment #4, that did delete my Amendment #3. I regret that I was not aware of that and it is correct. Mr. Walsh was correct that that excellent Amendment #3 for reasons unknown to me was deleted from the Bill and they're not now in the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Let the record show that Representative



Walsh was correct. Representative McGrew objects. Poll the absentees. I would just like to mention that it's now 11:50 on the last day to consider Spring Calendar Bills. "

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees; Abramson. Ewell. Hanahan. Hoffman. Hudson. Johnson. Emil Jones. Klosak. McBroom. Robbins. Schlickman. Stearney. E.G. Steele. Winchester. And, J.J. Wolf. "

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative; Alexander. Anderson. Balanoff. Beatty. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Bullock. Capuzi. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Dyer. Ebbesen. Epton. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Dave Jones. Kane. Katz..."

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

Katz: "Cause I want to be recorded as 'present', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'present'."

Clerk Leone: "Keane. Kelly. Kosinski. Kuals. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Macdonald. Madigan. Mahar. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Molloy. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. Oblinger. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Peters. Pierce. Polk. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Reed. Richmond. Ronan. Sandquist. Schisler. Schneider. Sharp. Slape. Stanley. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Telcser. Vitek. VonBoeckman. Watson. White. Willer. Williams. Williamson. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Hudson, for what purpose do you arise?"



Hudson: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Hudson recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

Hudson: "Would you please vote me as 'no'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'no'. Any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call, Mr. Deuster?"

Deuster: "Oh, one or two or three, I guess. Alexander. Balanoff"

Speaker Redmond: "Here. Balanoff?"

Deuster: "Balanoff."

Speaker Redmond: "She's in the aisle next to Giorgi."

Deuster: "Beatty. Oh, there he is."

Speaker Redmond: "Beatty? He's the Gentleman is in."

Deuster: "Yes.."

Speaker Redmond: "... .. Coat. Representative Schneider."

Deuster: "Braun. Braun."

Schneider: "Hold on, would you please? What did you do with Alexander?"

Speaker Redmond: "She's there."

Schneider: "Oh, she's there, right? Okay. I thought you were just going so rapidly that they were being knocked off.

I can't keep track. What was the count, Tony?"

Speaker Redmond: "97 'aye'."

Schneider: "Alright. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan, 'aye'. Representative Peters desires to be verified, is that alright. Mr...?"

Deuster: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Deuster: "Braun. Carol Mosley Braun."

Speaker Redmond: "Inquiry, Representative Deuster?"

Deuster: "Yes, Sir. Mrs. Carol Mosley Braun."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun on the floor? How is she recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove her."

Deuster: "Mrs. Breslin."



Speaker Redmond: "She's here."

Deuster: "Oh, I see. Mr. Bullock."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Bullock? He's in the back with Representative Keane."

Deuster: "Mrs. Chapman."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman? How is she recorded? Wait a minute. She's there, standing up. Near Mugalian."

Deuster: "Mr. Dawson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dawson, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. (sic)."

Deuster: "Mr. Domico."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Domico? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Doyle."

Speaker Redmond: "He's in his seat. He's always in his seat."

Deuster: "John Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "John Dunn? Representative John Dunn? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Bruce Farley. Oh, I.."

Speaker Redmond: "He's in the aisle."

Deuster: ".. See him. Monroe Flinn."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Mr. Michael Getty."

Speaker Redmond: "How is Getty recorded?" Representative Braun has returned to the chamber. Put her back on the Roll Call." Representative Getty, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."



Deuster: "Mr. Henry."

Speaker Redmond: "Henry? He's down here."

Deuster: "Oh, yes. Mr. Kane."

Speaker Redmond: "Keane or Kane?"

Deuster: "Kane. K-a-n-e."

Speaker Redmond: "He's back there in... what is it- Mulcahey's seat? Mulcahey's in Dunn's seat."

Deuster: "Mr. Kulas."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Deuster: "Kulas."

Speaker Redmond: "Kulas."

Deuster: "Kulas. K-u-l-a-s."

Speaker Redmond: "Repres..."

Deuster: "Kulas. Kulas."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kulas here? Representative Kulas? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Representative Leon."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leon here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond : "Remove him."

Deuster: "Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Redmond: "Leverenz here? He's here. Joseph's coat."

Deuster: "Representative Marovitz."

Speaker Redmond: "Is he recorded? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Representative Mautino."

Speaker Redmond: "He's the man talking with Representative Leverenz."

Deuster: "Oh, I see him. Representative McPike."

Speaker Redmond: "McPike here? How is he recorded?"

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



Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Representative Mugalian."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here someplace. Oh, there he is.."

Deuster: "Oh, I see him. Representative Murphy."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leon has returned to the chamber. Put him back on the Roll Call. Leon. "

Deuster: "Representative Murphy. Well, there he is."

Speaker Redmond: " He's here."

Deuster: "Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Redmond: "He's right in the aisle there."

Deuster: "Representative Patrick."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Patrick? He's always here. That's not Patrick is it? Representativ Birch... Yeah, he's here."

Deuster: "Representative Pierce."

Speaker Redmond: "How is Pierce recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Representative Ronan."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Deuster: "Representative Sandquist."

Speaker Redmond: "He's right back here."

Deuster: "Representative Schisler."

Speaker Redmond: "Schisler? "

Deuster: "Schisler."

Speaker Redmond: "He's back there."

Deuster: "Way in the back. Representative Sharp."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Deuster: "Representative Steczo."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczo, he's down here."

Deuster: "Representative Taylor."

Speaker Redmond: "Taylor here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Representative VonBoeckman."



Speaker Redmond: "VonBoeckman here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Representative White."

Speaker Redmond: "Jesse White?"

Deuster: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded? He's here. Step in so he can see you. There he is. Any further questions?"

Deuster: "Representative Bullock."

Speaker Redmond: "We took him off once."

Deuster: "Oh, well I thought we could take him off again..."

Speaker Redmond: "We can't take him off twice, unless you let him put him on twice. Wait a minute. Representative Bullock is in back there."

Deuster: "I see. Rep..."

Speaker Redmond: "Put Representative Bullock back on."

Deuster: "Was Representative Beatty verified?"

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Deuster: "Beatty. Beatty. Beatty."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty here? How is he recorded?"

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

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

Schneider: "The challengers have gone through the list. Now they're going to go through another Roll Call. I think that's dilatory and comes at a bad time. They can do that some other time when we're not up against a deadline. But, it's a procedure that we've found unacceptable and I think you ought to remark on that and allow us to get the Roll Call and go on with the business of the House."

Deuster: "That was about our last question..."

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



Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, please change my vote to 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change Representative Skinner to 'yes'.

VonBoeckman has returned to the chamber. Put him back on the Roll Call as 'yes'. Representative Schraeder is 'yes'. Anything further? Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I believe Mr. Beatty was verified and he wanted to... If he was taken off, I think he was one of the first ones verified."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't recall. Did we verify Beatty? I think we did. Didn't I make a reference to Joseph's coat? "

Bradley: "Cause he said, 'Well, now I can go outside. I've been verified'."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, but in fairness to Representative Beatty... I believe he was verified. Does he have a checkered coat on today? And I referred to Joseph's coat, if my memory... So he was verified. Representative Keane, I think... I don't think they disturbed you. Representative Keane?"

Keane: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, you did ver... you did refer to Representative Beatty's coat being somewhat garish when you verified him."

Speaker Redmond: "That's what I thought. Now what's the total? No further questions, I take it. What's the total? 90 'aye's? 90 'aye's and 63 'no' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 1136. Skinner. Page eight."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1136, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly, this Bill is jointly sponsored by Representative Schraeder and myself. It is the least controversial of my assessment reform Bills. Its main purpose is to impose performance standards on supervisors of assessments



starting in 1984. There will be three performance standards which will be imposed four years hence on December 1st. The first will be that the assessor must assess statutory level. The second of which is that the.. this is the supervisor of assessments I'm talking about when I say, 'assessor'... The second of which is the deadline when the statutes must be met. We give them four years to get their cycles in order so tax bills won't go out late. The third performance standard is that the margin of error more technically known as the coefficient of dispersion, must be no worse than 50% on homes and lots. Now that is the most important performance standard in my opinion. Let me tell you what that means. If I can draw a sales tax analogy, if there were a five percent sales tax, as there may well be somewhere in the State of Illinois, and the checker had a 50% margin of error, and three people bought one hundred dollars worth of goods, the first person would pay \$2.50 in sales tax, the second person, \$5.00 sales tax and the third person \$7.50 sales tax. Now the state would not care because the state would still have received \$15.00 sales tax or five percent of the \$300.000 sale. But I would suggest that the person assessed correctly at \$5.00 sales tax and the person assessed at \$7.50 sales tax would go through the roof, especially if they knew that one-third of the people going through that line were going to get away with a \$2.50 sales tax. What I am suggesting is that if the assessments are worse than that, that the supervisor of assessments will not have met the performance standard, the minimum performance standard, that this law would set. What happens if the performance standards aren't met in... after 1984? Number one, there will be a public hearing by the Department of Revenue 60 days before the County Board votes on the



reappointment of the supervisor of assessments. If the supervisor of assessments is found by the Department of Revenue not to have met the minimum standards, the County Board may still reappoint that supervisor of assessments, but it's going to take a two-thirds vote. If the Department of Revenue finds that the supervisor of assessments has met the performance standards, then it would take a two-thirds vote to fire the good supervisor of assessments. The Bill does some other things which aren't as important. It does raise... It does eliminate salary limits which have been a real problem in one of my smaller counties, Boone County. They cannot pay enough to a supervisor of assessments to get a qualified person. It also raises minimum salaries to some extent and there is some state liability there because the state pays 50% of the salary of the supervisor of assessment. In addition, it gives supervisors of assessments more flexibility to adjust assessments within townships. This was done by the supervisor of assessments in Lake County a couple of years ago, right after Pat Morris was elected township assessor in Waukegan township and was found to be illegal. This clears up that legal point. It also allows the Board of Review the option of having the supervisor of assessments as Clerk or not having the supervisor of assessments as Clerk. At the present time it is mandatory that the supervisor of assessments be a Clerk of the Board of Review and since the Board of Review is a check and balance on the supervisor of assessments, there's a possibility of a conflict of interest. I would leave that up to the Board of Review. In addition, this mandates the supervisor of assessments to issue township multipliers and at the present time that mandate goes to the Board of Review. In the process township assessors would be... would be involved for the



first time and I would stress since supervisors of assessments do not exist in Cook County, this Bill obviously does not affect Cook County. The Board of Review is still mandated to equal... to equalize assessments if the supervisor of assessments refuses. Finally, there are several Bills that are coming out of the eastern part of the state with regard to sales ratio studies and the apparent incompetence of the Department of Revenue to get the information out on a timely basis. This Bill does not go to the timely basis, but it does go to the .. to the full dissemination of the information once it is available. This requires that sales ratio studies which tell the average assessment level and tell the margin of error to go to all local assessors. In the past, these ratio studies have gone only to supervisors of assessment and if the supervisors of assessments wish to sit upon them, they end up being sat on. This requires that the Department sends directly to every local assessor and multi-township assessor as well as each Member of the Board of Review. It also does something that the Board... that the Revenue Department doesn't often do. It requires the Department to send some interpretative data so that an ordinary human being can figure out what these sales ratio studies mean. If there any questions, I'd be happy to answer them. Representative Schraeder may wish to add to the.. to the argument. I'm willing to take any questions people have now, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Van Duyne?"

Van Duyne: "Well, I was just going to ask the net difference between the Board of Review's authority... I presume that you're mandating that they .. for out of township multiplier... I always thought that they had that



prerogative right now if they chose."

Skinner: "That is correct. They do have that prerogative right now and therein lies the problem. I can bring home to my home town of Woodstock ... I live in 'Door' township and about a third of the town is in 'Greenwood' township. This year apparently because my township assessor did a better job than the township assessor in the northern part of the town, I am going to have to pay ten percent higher taxes than the other people in my.. in my home municipality. That is just unfair. The Board of Review seems unwilling to do anything. The supervisor of assessments doesn't have the authority to do anything. We're paying supervisors of assessments good salaries. I think we ought to put... we ought to put the responsibilities with the people that are... that are... well, the people that are paid to do the job."

Van Duyne: "Okay. But my.. my specific question was, does this mandate that they put township multipliers or are they still discretionary?"

Skinner: "No, it mandates that they do it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder?"

Schraeder: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'd like to point out that this Bill is one of a series that has been promoted over the last few years by the Joint House-Senate Revenue Committee consisting of both the parties on a bipartisan basis. Numerous hearings were held throughout the state. In these... This particular Bill addresses some of the critical problems that exist in this part of government. I think it's a very central type of thing. It will see that we have competent in assessing procedures and competent assessors and supervisors of assessments. And I think it's extremely important that we pass this Bill out today, that we get it over to the Senate so they can take a look at it and follow up with all the hearings that were



held throughout the state. Those of you may remember and particularly those who served on the Committee that went to Southern Illinois and the problems they had with the supervisor of assessment and really, it says this, if a supervisor is doing a good job, he should continue. But if he doesn't meet minimum standards, then he should not be granted that privilege of serving the public and it's a very important piece of legislation. I would certainly urge both Members, from both sides of the aisle, to support this and give the necessary 89 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explanation of my vote there's just a couple of things I'd like to point out on this Bill. It moves the sales ratio to the most recent year. At the present time, we have difficulty with sales ratios. The assessors are always complaining that they have to have their books in on June 1 and they don't get the sales ratios studies from the Department of Local Governmental Affairs sometimes until as late as the next September or October. There is a Bill coming from, I believe it's been reported out of Revenue... It has been reported out of Revenue.. which makes the sales ratio the one that's established is definitely established. It moves it back one year which will increase the science... make the sales ratio study figures a lot more meaningful. In terms of letting everybody know what sales ratio studies are and various other information, the Department of Local Governmental Affairs, now the Department of Revenue, has been... does publish a book that's available to anyone that wants to take the time to read it and order it. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'no' vote, Cal comes up



with some real good Bills and I like to support him most of the time, but on this Bill I cannot for this reason, I was asked the other day to assess a piece of property. The property has decreased in value in the last two or three years. In supervisors of assessment in other counties where they have gone to the township thing, it has created a great deal of trouble and several law suits in our area. So I think that this Bill is a bad Bill and the Department of Local Government Affairs already tells the county how much they can... how much they have to pay in regards to how its assessed anyway. "

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was going to ask a question. I had my light on, but since that time has gone by I guess I'll have to put it in the form of a statement. As I'm looking over this Amendment that now became the Bill, seems to me where I see less... a county with less than 200,000 the pay will go from 11,500 to 23,000 and that's quite a jump. This is a mandate on my local government from the state and I don't believe it's a fair Bill. Therefore I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 109 'aye' and 17 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 677. Nope. 2222."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2222, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to license and regulate grain dealers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that some of my Bills are before their time. This may be one of those Bills, but if it is, I want somebody in the General Assembly to remember the next time we have a wave of



grain elevator bankruptcies that a Bill does exist or did exist in this Session and go back and pull it out and to take a look at it, make whatever minor improvements you want to and enact it. What this Bill does is attempt to take the burden off our backs if grain elevators start going bankrupt again in the State of Illinois as they have about every five to seven years. The last wave of grain elevator bankruptcies was about three years ago. It started in my district with a 'Grin' elevator which is on the Kane County, DeKalb County border. It caught extremely well informed farmers including the President of the Farm Bureau in DeKalb County. In addition there was another small elevator in my district that went under. Shortly thereafter, the record breaking grain elevator went under down in Junction in Representative Winchester and Harris' and Rea's district. That wave of grain elevator bankruptcies came about seven to eight years after the series of grain elevator bankruptcies that occurred in the early '70's. Now, the question I think we should ask ourselves is, 'What are we trying to accomplish with regard to grain elevators?' I'm not really trying to accomplish anything with regard to grain elevators. I am trying to accomplish something with regard to farmers. We license grain elevators. But nothing we have done in this General Assembly can guarantee that a farmer will not lose a large part of his livelihood if a grain elevator goes bankrupt. There is nothing we have passed in this General Assembly including the Bills that were passed as a result of this last grain elevator bankruptcies that will protect the farmer once he sells his grain in good faith to a grain elevator and accepts a little chip. There's nothing to protect him, to guarantee that he will be paid off. Now I would make the parallel with financial institutions. On the federal



level we have the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and we have SLIC and there's a similar insurance corporation for credit unions and what those... what those insurance schemes do, they're public insurance programs which every financial institution has to contribute to. What I'm attempting to do is set up a grain revolving fund which would provide limited protection to farmers who put.. put grain into grain elevators with the.. well, with the expectation that it will not go under. There is very.... It is not super protection. We're suggesting a \$20,000 upper limit per farmer and a million dollar limit per grain elevator. After about five years of operation under the ..under this Bill we think we'll have about a \$20 million fund assuming that there are no major bankruptcies. Of course, if there are major bankruptcies, the amount of money will... well, it'll take longer to reach 20 million. Alright, now this is a permissive Bill. I am... This is unlike the corn check-off Bill and it's unlike the soy bean check-off Bill. We are not even mandating that the farmers have a referendum on this. What we're saying is, if enough farmers get concerned around the state, they can... they can pass a petition and initiate a referendum. Then, if they pass the referendum, this.. well, this Bill kicks into being. There is a check-off which will occur at the grain elevator. It's one-tenth of one percent of the price of the grain sold that goes down as the... that percentage goes down to nothing when the fund reaches 20 million dollars. It is less than the cost of hail insurance... I find by calling my local County Companies... the local one in Springfield, the local agent. Alright, now what I'm suggesting here is that we approve this Bill which mandates nothing but does protect our rear ends as Legislators. The next time



There are
 there are grain elevator bankruptcies, if you represent a farm area or if you're concerned about farm areas, what you'll be able to say is, we met that problem in 1980. The Bill is on the books. You, Mr. Farmer, or Mr. Farmers, are responsible for not having put it into operation. You could have protected yourself if you had wanted to, but if you.. if they have not by then, it's going to be their own fault. That is the type of Bill I lay before you and I ask... I respectfully ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question... Representative Schisler."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill. Legislation of this type is long overdue. I advocated this legislation on the federal level 15 years ago and it was before its time. I hope it's not before its time in the Illinois General Assembly. I would say that representing farmers that this has been the number one problem that farmers have had since I've been in elected office. You can find farmers putting their grain in elevators, trusting their elevator operator, going to church with him, playing bridge with him, only to find out that he's been gambling, playing the Chicago Board of Trade with their money. And they wake up too late and that good old boy is gone to Africa or Hawaii with their money. So I'd like to see the passage of this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is... Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Brummer: "Representative Skinner, you indicated there was currently no protection. There's currently bonding available. Is there not?"



- Skinner: "It'll very minimal. One hundred thousand dollars maximum."
- Brummer: "Well, that depends on the size of the elevator."
- Skinner: "But the maximum is one hundred thousand dollars."
- Brummer: "Regardless of the size?"
- Skinner: "Yes."
- Brummer: "Well, that's ..."
- Skinner: "The minimum is much lower than that."
- Brummer: "I don't have the statute in front of me. I...I thought it was considerably higher than that. What... Do the various farm organizations such as the Illinois Farmers Union and the Illinois Farm Bureau and so forth have any position with regard to this legislation?"
- Skinner: "The Illinois Farmers Union is in favor of the Bill. The Illinois Farm Bureau apparently can't make up its mind. It is on their list of Bills to be considered and I asked their lobbyist.. one of their lobbyists this morning whether they had made up their mind at this...well extremely long meeting that they had over this week and he did not know. So I cannot. I cannot tell you where the Farm Bureau stands."
- Brummer: "In any event there's a one thousand dollar deductable and a \$20,000 maximum recovery with regard to any individual seller?"
- Skinner: "That is correct and that's the limit liability of the fund because, well, there may be another rash of bankruptcies and this... the amount of money we're pouring into the fund or farmers would pour into the fund might not be enough to cover everything."
- Brummer: "This is optional legislation? I think you said. There's a lot of noise back here and I can't hear.."
- Skinner: "This is so optional, Representative, that we don't even mandate a referendum by farmers. The farmers have to initiate the referendum."
- Brummer: "Okay. Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? Representative Slape."

Slape: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Skinner: "Yes, Sir."

Slape: "Cal, is there a provision in here that if an elevator does go under and they have to go to recovery fund, does he lose his license? Or is that..."

Skinner: "If an elevator owner goes under and the fund has to be touched, that Gentleman or Lady cannot ever get into the grain elevator business again unless he repays the fund everything which was lost, which was paid to the farmers. And I think that's an adequate protection."

Slape: "Alright. It is fair."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is, 'Shall this....' Representative Skinner? Oh, Representative Ropp, so small I didn't see him."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, just a question, Cal. And I haven't read it completely, but, after the referendum has passed who administers this fund that is already set up then?"

Skinner: "That's on page six of the Bill which has not been amended. And it is a... It's a Board consisting of six Members who are producers with no financial interest in any grain dealers business or holdings and three Members who are grain dealers of which one shall be a trucker dealer. So we're giving a two to one majority to farmers with no interest in grain elevators, but we're putting elevator owners on the Board so that the expertise will be there."

Ropp: "Is the fund then and is the Board statewide or is it by market producing area, elevator area? If you..."

Skinner: "They would be appointed by the Director and so it would be to the discretion of the Director."

Ropp: "Well, I mean is this something then that the entire state would have to vote on at one time? Or if there is a large



elevator that is in a shaky position and those farmers who deliver to it say, 'We'd better have a referendum..'"

Skinner: "No, I understand your question. This would have to work. You cannot do it on a county by county basis. It would have to pass a statewide referendum. Within your question is the answer. It would... This will be an extremely difficult fund to get off the ground. I mean it will... There will have to be an extremely serious situation because, obviously.. I mean, I don't even think the people in McHenry County care about the people who lost money at the 'Grarin's' bankruptcy. We're setting up an extremely high burden of passage if you will on the part of the farm communities. The farm community is really going to have to want this to get it."

Ropp: "Okay. May I speak for... on behalf of the Bill? Actually I don't see anything totally wrong with the Bill. It is a permissive Bill and as hard as it was to get the corn check-off Bill passed, I doubt if this Bill would ever become a reality other than this does provide the machinery for that permission to go into effect. The thing will probably have.. will actually happen, we'll have a number of elevators that will continue to go broke and then finally their farmers will want that passed, this referendum. Unfortunately, we.. this Bill does not provide any protection prior to any elevators going broke. We're going to have to have more go broke before people will really implement this law."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schueman."

Schueman: "Question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schueman: "Cal, does this Bill touch in any way the present requirements for certified public accounting or bonding that's in our present grain warehousing law?"

Skinner: "No, as you can see from the Bill, all of it is new language. I'm repealing nothing that exists there at



the present time."

Schuneman: "Okay. One of your previous drafts, I think, did touch present system of CPA audits and bonding and I just wanted to make sure that that's not in this Bill."

Skinner: "Not at all."

Schuneman: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Skinner: "Yes, Sir."

Friedrich: "Out of these people that lost their money in Representative Winchester's district and yours, how many of them were in there on a price layer contract trying to avoid paying storage and take a free ride on the elevator operator?"

Skinner: "Well, Representative, I'm sure the testimony that has been... that we've had before numerous Committees would be able to answer that question. The answer is some of them certainly were. But if you're trying to suggest that the farmers who lost money were all irresponsible, I would have to disagree with you. I don't think that one could call the President of the Farm Bureau in DeKalb County irresponsible."

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I would say this, that the reason most people get gypped by an elevator going broke is because they took a free ride. They brought their grain in. They weren't willing to pay storage and take a warehouse receipt. They took a price layer contract and the elevator operator sold his grain and played the future market and went broke. But in the meantime, the farmer was doing it this way because he wasn't willing to pay storage like everyone else did, get a warehouse receipt from a bonded warehouse."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Ready for the question.."

Skinner: "... Ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Skinner, to close. The question is, 'Shall



this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. We'll be having a break very shortly so those who are contemplating sending out for lunch, you might recognize that. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I wonder if the Speaker could be so kind as to give us an expected schedule for the rest of the day?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, depends on the attendance. I'll stay here as long as we have enough people to pass some Bills. By judging on the number we have on the Calendar and the slow progress so far, theoretically we could be here till midnight. Now, what we're going to do is there will be a break very shortly for lunch and then we'll see what happens. Probably no break for dinner though. You know what happens on get-away days as well as I do. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the intent of the Chair is to take up Constitutional Amendments today."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know what I'm going to do yet. Depends on what... Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I know you haven't announced the vote totals, but I would like to express my appreciation and to express my opinion that those who are voting for this Bill may have absolutely clean consciences if a grain elevator goes bankrupt in their area."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 'aye's, and five 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 821, Representative Representative Younge. Now this is a Bill that we took out of the record before. We've had all the full discussion and Representative Piel had asked what vote was necessary. The Parliamentarian consulted the statute, advises me that it takes 89 votes. Now the question is, 'Shall...' You got 821 on there? We've had the full discussion. That was the only inquiry. "



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 821, a Bill for an Act relating to industrial parks. Third Reading of the Bill."

Younger "To review the subject matter, the Bill as presently amended would give the Illinois Industrial Development Authority the power to build industrial parks. An industrial park is an area of land in which several manufacturing or industrial plants are located. The Bill as presently drafted has nothing to do with bonding and it only is in grant of authority to the Illinois Industrial Development Authority to build industrial parks. And I ask for your approval of this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative... The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Walsh? No. Have all voted who wish? Representative Henry? Representative Younge?"

Younge: "May I explain my vote? One of the situations we have in the East St. Louis area is the fact that 'Hunter' Packing Company has taken two options on land in Missouri. It is the largest industrial plant left in East St. Louis, Illinois. This Bill does not only apply to East St. Louis, but I just bring that up as an example of a situation which if there is development by the Illinois Industrial Development Authority, industrial areas that set aside land for... for plants and manufacturing establishments, we will be able to retain industry rather than losing it to surrounding states. The Illinois Industrial Development Authority wants this grant of power. And it needs it to free it from its present limited jurisdiction which is it has to have a loan application by a particular business for a particular building to be put on a particular site. And the simple issue here is to give it a grant of authority to develop industrial districts which is what we need. In Illinois at the present time the Industrial Development Authority



has only developed 2500 jobs. The state of New Hampshire which has such authority to build industrial parks has built 21 of them and has developed 55,000 jobs. And I ask you for this grant of power to the Illinois Industrial Development Authority for those purposes."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 93 'aye' and 50 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mahar, for what purpose do you arise?"

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask for a Republican conference in room 118 for about 40 minutes. Republican conference."

Speaker Redmond: "House will stand in recess untill 1:30, purpose of Republican conference. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, before we leave I'd like to take a moment to introduce in the Speaker's gallery, the Flannigan Swing Choir from the Flannigan High School, represented by Representative Ewing, Hoxsey and Breslin."

Speaker Redmond: "One thirty. We're on recess for a minute. Resolutions. One thirty."

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

Speaker Redmond: "That long enough?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 730, Dave Jones. Whereas, the highly esteemed colleague in the House of Representatives, the Honorable Josephine K. Oblinger, and her accomplished husband, Walter, will celebrate their 40th wedding anniversary, April 27, 1980, and Whereas, this attractive couple was married April 27, 1940 at the 'Bethany Union Church', Chicago, Illinois has spent 40 blissfull years traveling the path of life and harmony with God and Man and each other, and Whereas, at the time of their marriage Walter was employed by the FBI and Josephine was a school teacher, the church



was crammed with her students as they took their nuptial vows, and Whereas the son, Carl, was born as the fruit of this happy union and now there are two grandchildren, Eric and Jennifer, and Whereas, Representative Oblinger and her husband are both prominent lawyers and Mrs. Oblinger has been active in Springfield as a teacher of history and law, Sangamon County Clerk, and Capital Township Clerk and Assessor, Assistant Director and Director of important departments of State Government, was named Springfield Woman of the Year in government, was chosen by American women for International Understanding for Women to Women Contact Mission to Greece, Turkey, and Iran in 1975, and was elected to the General Assembly in 1978, Therefore be it Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-First General Assembly of the State of Illinois that we heartily congratulate our distinguished colleague, the Honorable Joseph (sic) K. Oblinger, and her accomplished husband, Walter, on their 40th wedding anniversary, April 27, 1980, and that we extend to them our best wishes for many more happy wedding anniversaries and be it further Resolved that a suitable copy of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to Representative Josephine K. and Mr. Walter Oblinger."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative J. David Jones."

Jones: "I'd like to move the adoption of this Resolution and a salute to my seatmate and colleague and she may have a few words to say and her husband Wally is in the gallery. So it's very appropriate that we do it at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. And the Resolution's adopted. Representative Oblinger."



Oblinger: "On behalf of Wally and me I want to thank all of you. I would never have been able to do all of the things I have done if I didn't have his help."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski wants to know if the fiscal note has been filed with that Resolution."

Speaker Bradley: "House will be in order. Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3609, Campbell, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3610, Deuster, a Bill for an Act relating to vacancies in the Office of Judge of Circuit Court of Cook County. First Reading of the the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Kornowicz? You have four Bills. Do you want those called? You usually don't have any controversial legislation. Representative Skinner? Representative Watson in the chamber? He's had a Bill that he wanted called. 757? House Bill 1030."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1030, this Bill has been read a third time previously."

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

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. President (sic). This Bill has been referred to as the 'Insurance Red Lining Bill' that affects Cook County Hospital. As you know it was heard before. It's on Postponed Consideration. And briefly what the Bill does, it applies to automobile and fire extended coverage insurance in Cook County only and it prohibits the insurance companies from using one factor of classification and that's geographic location. All other factors including age of building or age of driver or that are still available to the companies. The Bill has one Amendment on it and the Amendment says that if a company, an insurance company, cancels or non-renews or refuses to issue a fire and extended coverage policy, the applicant has .. is entitled to access



to the company's files. The Amendment also says that the applicant has the right to correct any erroneous information on the file. The statute... The Amendment would also allow the Director to receive... He would receive information from the companies regarding the fire and automobile insurance policies issued by zip code area. I'd be happy to answer any questions. I ask for a favorable consideration."

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

Grossi: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Grossi: "Representative Keane, does this establish one insurance rate for the County of Cook?"

Keane: "No, it does it. It... All of the... There are a number of rating factors that are used by insurance companies in setting rates. This is. The location of the risk is one of those factors. All it would do in Cook County would say that you cannot use geographical location as a factor, one of those factors, in either fire and extended coverage or in automobile."

Grossi: "Isn't it possible to have in the same zip code area different classifications under your Bill?"

Keane: "What... My Bill was entered... The reason for the Bill was that some insurance companies were using zip code. They were using zip code locations which had no rhyme or reason for insurance purposes. The purpose of zip codes is to assist the Post Office in delivering mail and they were usually based on the location of a postal substation. The fact that the companies used a postal .. the zip codes for insurance rating purposes has created a tremendous number of inequities. There are also other geographic loca... geographic factors which companies use which are just as inequitable. My Bill would prohibit them from using the geographic location. All of Cook County would be one location."



Grossi: "All of Cook County will be one quotation (sic)?"

Keane: "Yeah.. In terms of the factor of loca...In terms of the factor that they use for setting the rates, you know, there are a number of factors. One of them is location of risk. In terms of that factor, Cook County, anything in Cook County, would have the same.. would be treated the same."

Grossi: "Will this cause an increase in the insurance rate of the suburbanite versus a city dweller?"

Keane: "In some cases, it would and in some cases it wouldn't. It depends. There are... There are some zip codes that .. in the suburban areas that would.. it would occur and there are some that it would not occur. And you have to... You have to... Representative Grossi, you have to look at the different companies because different companies use different geographic areas in setting their rates. So there's no... there's no similarity."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Mahar: "Representative Keane, does this deal with fire insurance did you say?"

Keane: "Fire and .. fire and automobile."

Mahar: "How does the ratings in suburbia for example, you have different fire ratings. How would that be affected by this Bill?"

Keane: "It's my understanding that the Chicago fire rating is the best in state."

Mahar: "They don't have it anymore."

Keane: "Well, it's rated as one. I mean, it's.. The whole city is rated as one."

Mahar: "No... I beg to differ with you. Over their class now there is no rating for that class."

Keane: "You mean with... You're talking about how insurance



companies..."

Mahar: "About fire.."

Keane: "Alright. I thought you meant the ratings of the efficiency of the Fire Department. The.. It would affect the ratings by suburban... by insurance companies if they have different insurance rates.. or rates that differentiate between subur... in suburban Cook County. It would.. by location, only the rating factor of the loation, it would nullify those."

Mahar: "Well how... One more question. How would this affect... How would this Bill affect say, two towns, one town that has a class 5 rating and one that has a class 7? Would there be any affect on it?"

Keane: "For the location rating, if you're talking about a rating by location, and that's the factor, not the Fire Department rating, if there was a difference in the ratings of the efficiencies of the fire service, it would not affect that."

Mahar: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman?"

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we should pay particular attention to this Bill regardless of where we live in Illinois. What this Bill says is that an insurance company cannot use a geographical rating system within, in this case, the County of Cook. I think that your answer, Representative, to Representative Mahar was incorrect in one sense in that if you happen to have within Cook County two different towns with different fire rating classification, what your Bill says is that you... that an insurance company cannot recognize those two classifications. And, to the Members of the House, if you live in Cook County, outside the city of Chicago, you should be voting against this Bill because for all practical purposes, it's going to raise your automobile insurance



rates. For those of us who live downstate, we should be against the Bill because this could be the beginning of a statewide rating system that would take away from our constituents the rights that they presently enjoy. They have lower insurance premiums and the premiums would tend to be leveled from... throughout the state. The same rates would apply in Chicago as apply downstate. And I don't think we should start that precedent which is started by this Bill. I think the Bill was defeated by the House when it was voted upon last year. It should get that same fate again today. Geographical rating for insurance purposes is a sound, actuarial method of determining an insurance rate and we should not depart from that."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey?"

Mulcahey: "Move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mulcahey? The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. And Mr. Keane to close the debate."

Keane: "Representative... Thank you. Representative Schuneman has provided probably the major opposition.. the reasons for the opposition to the Bill. I think however, that there's really little likelihood that the whole of Illinois will become by location... location will not become a factor. The Bill that is provided allows for... allows insurance compan... It will stop insurance companies from using arbitrary ratings within Cook County. The arbi... It's so arbitrary that different companies... Allstate uses the zip codes, other companies.. Travelers and other companies use different factors. Some of them have taken all of Cook County and divided into four areas. So there is no rhyme or reason. I would be very happy if the insurance companies could get together or the Department of Insurance



could come together and justify reasonable areas. They have not done this. This causes a great injustice to the people in Cook County and I see it more as an injustice, a present injustice, of the people of Cook County as versus the possibility of a problem for the whole state later. And I'd ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr... Mr. Darrow, would you come to the podium please? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Mr. Bullock? For what purpose do you arise?"

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I think that this Bill goes a long way to insuring that there's equity in the State of Illinois. Many states have considered similar proposals before and I think the Sponsor has very eloquently indicated that the Bill is not as restrictive as some of the opponents would have us to believe, that companies for basing automobile body liability rates, that the city of Chicago in effect would be the only city involved and affected and that the insurance pool or the risk would in fact allow broader coverage to the residents of that area. And I think the issue addressed by this Bill is how widely should the risk be spread and I think that the Sponsor has indicated that the Bill would add that discrimination to the definition of unfair and deceptive acts or practices. I would certainly urge my colleagues to give the Gentleman consideration and hopefully give us some additional green lights on this measure. Representative Keane, as you know, has worked very closely with the state agencies and with the private



insurance to get concensus on this matter and I would like to see a few additional green lights if possible."

Speaker Bradley: "We have a... Yeah, we're going to take a new Roll Call. It's been called to my attention that the switches were locked and we want to be fair so, all in favor of House Bill 1030 signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Darrow wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 54 'aye's, 66 'no's, and this Bill, having failed to gain a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 2165. Yes, for what purpose does Mr. Mulcahey, the Gentleman from Winnebago, arise?"

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, I move we adjourn."

Speaker Bradley: "We didn't recognize you for that purpose. We'll let you know. You're ahead of yourself, Sir. Mr.."

Clark Leone: "House Bill..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr... Yes, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2165, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 2165 deals with a similar subject matter as the prior Bill. This Bill has nothing whatever to do with rating or the question of rating. The Bill originally did and that has been amended out by Amendment #3, I believe, offered by Representative Wolf. The basic concept of House Bill 2165 now provides for this, it says that the Insurance Department will set up minimum standards by which a piece of property will be judged as to whether or not it will receive insurance or have to go into the 'fair plan.' I think every Member is aware of the practice of certain insurance companies of setting aside a



certain neighborhood or area in which they ascertain that property within this location will have to go into the 'fair plan', thereby raising insurance costs and not providing as much insurance as the owner of the property may wish to receive. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think everyone is also aware of the renaissance in many parts of the state whereby people are rehabilitating and rejuvenating old properties. And when these properties have the work done to them they are clearly and certainly eligible to be insured outside of the 'fair plan'. However, if you fall into a certain geographic neighborhood or area, you lose the opportunity to be insured privately. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, let me again emphasize to you, this is not a rating Bill. It's a fair, honest piece of legislation which will let each one of us, or each one of our constituents have the opportunity if our properties meet the standards to have our properties insured by a private insurance firm and thereby receive the type of insurance coverage which we wish to have in our homes. I'd be delighted to answer any questions, if possible, and would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

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

Gaines: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There are many districts in the city of Chicago where the insurance companies take a whole zip code and declare a person 'non grata' or off-limits for the quality type of insurance that people who have quality property are usually entitled to. It's not because a particular house or home does not meet the standards, but because a large zip code area. Now there may well be parts of that zip code that are properly defined as uninsurable. But when you take a whole zip code, that included 100,000 dollar properties as well as 15,000



dollar properties, you are doing a disservice to all the people. To have a limited amount of insurance can be catastrophic. To have no insurance means that mortgages come due. You are putting undue harm on the people who are trying to build themselves a life that they can be proud of. You are penalizing working people who have worked all their lives, go out, find a vacant lot, build a home, and then find they can't get insurance to cover the value of that home. Then, whatever insurance they get they have to go to the so-called 'fair plan' which should be called the 'unfair plan,' because it puts undue limitations on the home owner, even if he can show that his house has the latest safety features. His house is still treated as though it were a drafty shack. So, in the name of the home owners, who want to do the right thing, and who you condemn when they don't do the right thing, please vote for this Bill. This is a Bill to help the home owner who wants to do the right thing and to protect his or her property. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is another of the Bills supported by the Illinois Public Action Council which were designed to do something about the problem of red lining in the city of Chicago. And, while I support the general thrust of what they're trying to do, I have to object to the way they're going about doing it. This Bill, as amended, one of the things that it would do is precisely what was included in House Bill 1030, which was just defeated here. One of the things that this Bill says is that the insurance Director cannot consider the geographic location in setting up the criteria for the rating of insurance. And, I think that that's a step in the wrong direction. It's the same principle that was involved in the last Bill and the House defeated that Bill



and I think that we should defeat this Bill in spite of the good Sponsor and others who have spoken in favor of it."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Telcser to close the debate."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think over the years this House has been eminently fair for the people of Illinois. And there's only one question to be answered this afternoon regarding this subject matter. The question is, if you and I have a home or a piece of property that meets the minimum standards, we ought to be entitled to buy insurance for it. That's the question. That's the issue. Nothing else. We ought not be here trying to defend this system that arbitrarily prevents you and I from obtaining insurance. That's what we've been talking about. We're not setting up a rating system. And we're not asking for zones. We're only saying that my house has good electric service and if my house is a brick home and if my house is safe and sound and secure, I ought to be able to buy insurance. That's all we're asking for. And that seems fair. And, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think the House of Representatives has always put the people of Illinois first and has always put their interests first and I know that every Member of this House wants to do the right thing for their constituents and perhaps one day, for themselves. I think the renaissance in Illinois, in old neighborhoods and old properties is good for Illinois. And yet, many people who do that, who risk their capital and risk their time are unable to properly insure their properties. With House Bill 2165 under the supervision of the Department of Insurance will be able to buy fair, equitable insurance policies and not be forced into the 'fair plan' when we don't deserve to be. And, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd appreciate a favorable Roll



Call on House Bill 2165."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 12165 (sic) pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very important Bill. And I listened very closely to the explanation of the Sponsor and he's absolutely correct. This is an area that has been discussed in this General Assembly for some time. But his approach and the approach on House Bill 2165 is a reasonable approach. What we're addressing to and especially in areas primarily within the city of Chicago... and I'll give you a specific example, my own Legislative District. 'Logan Square' a few years back was an area of change. Within the last two years it's changed again. Buildings that were four or five years ago selling for \$30,000 are in excess of \$90,000 presently. That area is insured under the 'fair plan'. The area that Representative Telcser was talking about is the area that he represents. That area has also experienced some change. It went bad. It went good. But unfortunately, under the present insurance rating in the State of Illinois, the buildings located within our respective communities have to be insured under the 'fair plan.' This is a very reasonable approach. It's an approach that we're asking... I may know it doesn't affect my friends from downstate Illinois. I know you don't have that type of problem. But it does affect us. It affects the residents within our community adversely. And for this reason, I'm asking the people who may have not voted on this issue to seriously consider an 'aye' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

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



wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Mr.

Telcser requests a poll of the absentees. Mr. Schuneman?

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, if this Bill should require... should get the required number of votes, I'd like to ask for a verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Fine. Call the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees; Abramson. Balanoff. Beatty. Bell. Capuzi. Casey. Deuster. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Epton. Getty. Griesheimer. Hallstrom. Harris. Jaffe. Johnson. Emil Jones. Klosak. Laurino. Marovitz. McBroom. McGrew. Meyer. Mugalian. O'Brien. Pechous. Pierce. Schlickman. Schneider..."

Speaker Bradley: "O'Brien 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Slape. Stearney. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Taylor. Walsh. Watson..."

Speaker Bradley: "Watson, 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Wikoff..."

Speaker Bradley: "Wikoff, 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Winchester. J.J. Wolf. And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question there are 80 'aye's, 54 'no's. And this Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 660."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 660, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Yesterday was my day of controversy. Today is my day of everybody agreeing, I hope. This Bill is not the original Bill as was introduced. Thanks for the whistles. It was amended, you'll recall, last week and this is really now.. has the support of all parts of the liquor industry, the Liquor Control Commission, and actually one of my co-supporters,



Larry DiPrima, had the Bill. He was introducing it new and I had this vehicle that we could do it in this way. What it does.... All it does in its present form is that under our current Dram Shop Act, distributors of beer can sell what they call 'keg at the dock' or sell it by the case. And what is happening in a number of areas, there have been sales this way. They've been doing away with the retailer and this way the state has been losing part of its tax. It does, as I say, have the support of all of the industry and the Liquor Control Commission and I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109 'aye's, three 'nay's. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer, for what purpose do you arise?"

Willer: "Mr. Speaker, if it's appropriate, I don't know if if is or not, I just wanted to briefly ask for suspension of the rules regarding posting of Bill so it could get out of the way. Want to wait? Or do it now?"

Speaker Bradley: "You had until noon today to post for next week. You didn't get that done?"

Willer: "No, I did not. Because.."

Speaker Bradley: "What's the number of the Bill?"

Willer: "The numbers of the Bills, the package of Bills, are House Bill 620, 21, 22 and 23 and it's my fault and I feel very badly. It was a misunderstanding with the Sponsor. I was..."

Speaker Bradley: "That your Committee?"

Willer: "Human Resources Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Would you give those numbers to us again slower?"



Willer: "House Bill 620, 621, 622, and 623." And it was my error and I feel very badly about it."

Speaker Bradley: "Has that been cleared with the Leadership..."

Willer: "Yes."

Speaker Bradley: "On the other ..."

Willer: "Oh.."

Speaker Bradley: "Any objection? There are objections. You'd better check with the Leadership on the other side. Alright."



Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Giorgi, what purpose do you rise?

House Bill 2955. The Gentleman wishes to call that back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Is there leave? Hearing no objections, we'll move it back to Second Reading."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, there are two Amendments to be placed on this Bill at this time. This is the so-called Chrysler Bill. Mine is Amendment #17 and Skinner's going to have Amendment #18 that I have accepted. This Bill, this Amendment sort of takes out the straight jacket features that we had in the original Bill. We're not using general obligation bonds. We're allowing the Director of the Budget and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Commerce Director and the Governor to constantly negotiate with Chrysler as to how much money they really need and because the Lottery... the instant... the daily Lottery is going to realize more than 20 million dollars than was anticipated..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Giorgi, one minute please. What purpose does the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis arise?"

Davis: "Speaker, I guess an inquiry. I don't really understand what's going on. 2955 doesn't have any deadlines and I'm willing to sit with Representative Giorgi all next week and debate Amendments to the Bill. But I thought we were on a deadline status for House Bills on Third Reading. And what are we doing on this order of business? We all want to go home and if we're through, let's go home."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, we were trying to, just a few minutes ago as you well know, looking for something to do. We've been on postponed consideration Bills..."

Davis: "If we don't have anything to do, let's go home Gerry."

Speaker Bradley: "We're starting to fill up with work right now and this is a federal deadline on this Bill."



Giorgi: "If Davis had been here when we first called the House to order, the Members that were on the floor of the House, there was a motion made to consider their Bills with the highest priority because they were here on time. I'm here on time everyday, no slurring anyone else. But anyway, the Bill, I spoke on it with ... Members of the House. What it provides for is a continual dialogue with the Governor and the Bureau of the Budget and the Bureau of the Commerce and Development and they are constantly speaking to Chrysler as to what they really need in the form of loans. Now because the daily Lottery has taken off like a meteor and they're going to receive more than 20 million dollars in over anticipated revenues, we feel we can create a loan, guaranteed loan trust fund. Now, in the Bill also, it provides that the collateralization of the Chrysler loan reach 150% rather than 100%, and if the Bureau of the Budget and the Governor and the Director of Commerce and Development feel they don't want to grant Chrysler the loan, they have that authority. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion. Mr. Skinner on the Amendment."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I think the principle is rotten that this Bill is based on but that doesn't mean that we shouldn't adopt the Amendment and get the hell on with the work of the House."

Giorgi: "I agree."

Skinner: "You agree it's a rotten Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "Clerk will read the Amendment."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #17, Giorgi. Amends House Bill 2955 as amended and so forth."

Giorgi: "I move for the adoption of Amendment #17."

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

Birkinbine: "Mr. Speaker, question of the Parliamentarian. If this Bill is amended, as Mr. Giorgi would like it to be, is this going to change the number of votes that it



will need to... for eventual passage from 107 down to 89?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes."

Giorgi: "We are not going to use general obligation bonds. We're just going to use the full faith and credit of our State of Illinois but not general obligation bonds. We're tying the state to guarantee them a loan. Not with 107 votes. It's going to take 89 votes."

Birkinbine: "Then if I could speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Birkinbine: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we defeated the efforts to pass this Chrysler loan Bill the other day. This is simply a move on the part of the Sponsor to change things around in such a way that he needs fewer votes to get it passed. I urge all of you who opposed this bad idea the other day to oppose this Amendment which is simply a way to make it easier to slide this slimy thing through. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Totten: "Is it my understanding, Mr. Giorgi, that your Amendment would now earmark Lottery funds to bail out the chancey situation of Chrysler?"

Giorgi: "Only, only after the Governor, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the new Director of Commerce agree that the loan is tenable and that it's a good risk. Only then would we trigger in a loan and then the General Assembly has to appropriate the funds."

Totten: "We would then earmark money out of the Lottery fund to Chrysler when we have rejected earmarking money from the Lottery to education and other matters in the past."

Giorgi: "Well let's clear the air on that. When we first tried to pass the Lottery, I accepted four Amendments.



Twenty-five percent of the proceeds that go to education, 25% to cities and counties and townships, 25% for scholarships, and 25% percent for elderly programs, but the Senate, in their wisdom, stripped all four of those Amendments off. And we were in a Special Session in 1973, the House accepted the removal of those four Amendments and that's where the fallacy began that the Lottery funds were going to be used for education. We did have Amendments for education, but the Senate, in their wisdom, pulled them off."

Totten: "What criteria would the tricot that you set up to put this approval on, what criteria would they have to make the determination?"

Giorgi: "The criteria that indeed the loan is 150% collateralized that indeed Chrysler will be able to pay the loan off, that indeed they're satisfied that everything's been done to safeguard the money in the State of Illinois. That's..."

Totten: "Where does it say that?"

Giorgi: "In the Amendment, if you have it in front of you."

Totten: "Where?"

Giorgi: "Amendment #17."

Totten: "I got it but whereabouts?"

Giorgi: "On page three, Section 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, in Section 5. The first line on page four, second line, sixth line, twelfth line, ~~seventeenth~~ line, twenty-fifth line, and thirty-fifth line. It repeats throughout the entire Bill the guarantee."

Totten: "Are they similar to what was in the Bill as originally introduced?"

Giorgi: "Yes. There hasn't been any change except we aren't using general obligation bonds. All other Amendments are included."

Totten: "What happens if as what's traditionally happened with Lotteries after the immediate surge of revenues going in



for a new game, the Lottery revenues start to go down.

And then we don't have the money."

Giorgi: "Thank you for that question. I should have thought of that myself."

Totten: "You're welcome."

Giorgi: "What's happened is they've anticipated about 40 billion dollars from the Lottery net this year. Because of the daily game is doing such a fantastic job, they expect by June 30 that there'll be over 25 million more than they anticipated. So we're going to take that 20 of that 25 million that we didn't anticipate and create this corporate loan fund. That's the only reason. There's a cap on it. There's a limit to it."

Totten: "Those funds... one of the reasons that the daily game was put in and agreed upon was because the additional revenue that it would generate into the GRF fund that could be used for tax relief, could be used for schools, could be used for any of the other multiplicity of things that we use the general revenue fund for. Now you have determined arbitrarily that we're going to use that money created by that daily game which may only be temporary to earmark it in a specific fashion."

Giorgi: "We only need the money temporarily. We'll have the 20 million, if this is appropriated by both Houses of the General Assembly and signed by the Governor, we'll have the 20 million by June 30 and that's the money that wasn't anticipated. Can I ask you a respectful question?"

Totten: "I'll yield."

Giorgi: "Did you vote for the Lottery?"

Totten: "No."

Giorgi: "The answer was no."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, on the Amendment, I think that the Amendment, of course, is an attempt to bail out a bad bail-out Bill and make it slide through here in an easier fashion. I don't think the mechanics are putting



together the procedure any better than the Bill as in its first fashion, and, in fact, this is probably more risky than the original Bill. And I would recommend a no vote on Amendment #17."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman moves the previous question."

All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye'. Aye. Opposed 'no'. The ayes have it. Gentleman's motion prevails. Mr. Giorgi to close."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I think the Amendment that we placed on this Bill makes it tenable as it leaves the responsibility where it should be, the Governor, Bureau of the Budget, and the Director of Commerce. There's no use in going into the Bill itself as to if this corporation were to go down in eight weeks of unemployment compensation they would reach the 20 million dollars we're talking about. And inasmuch as the majority of the people that oppose this Bill don't feel that the Lottery dollars are that honorably received. It might be a good idea to use the Lottery dollars to help a corporation that means so much to the economy of the State of Illinois. I urge support for this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Question's on the adoption of the Amendment."

All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. Amendment #18. Roll Call has been requested. All in favor of the Amendment signify by voting aye, opposed by voting no. And Mr. Davis to explain his vote."

Davis: "Well Mr. Speaker, it's quite apparent that this should be probably the vehicle of the Lottery because it's going to be risky as hell and the odds are very good that Chrysler will not succeed and ultimately have to lose the money out of the general revenue fund. Now the Sponsor is very slick. He told you now we'll not



go to bonding. We'll go to the general revenue fund since that only takes 89 votes to pass this vote on final passage. The largest single question people ask in the districts back home is where the hell's the Lottery money that was supposed to go to the schools? Well it's in the general revenue fund. We have a hard enough time explaining that to the general public because they only get their proportionate share now. Now we propose to take 20 million dollars out of the Lottery fund and deny the schools that. Why are there 79 green votes? It's a mystery to me. Vote no."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all... Have all voted who wish?"

The Clerk will take the record. This question there are 85 ayes, 58 nays and the Amendment's adopted." Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #18, Skinner. Amends House Bill 2955 as amended as so forth."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly, on Monday in the Wallstreet Journal article which indicated that the Chrysler deal was unravelling the last part of the article indicated to me that Michigan had a stronger collateral definition than did the Illinois Bill. And so I requested that copies of the Michigan Bills be procured. They have been. Amendment #18 puts the same collateral, or a similar collateral provision in the Illinois Bill that is in the Michigan Bill. Since Michigan is risking 150 million dollars and we're only being asked to gamble 20 million dollars, I assume that the Michigan Sponsors may have been a bit more diligent in protecting Michigan's investment, than perhaps we have been in Illinois. I would offer Amendment #18 in the hope that our collateralization would be better, although I certainly do not guarantee that will be the effect if it's adopted."

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



Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with the Amendment and I accept the Amendment. I urge the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Question's on the adoption of Amendment #18. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. They ayes have it and the Amendment's adopted."

Skinner: "Perhaps we should have requested a new Chrysler for the Governor every year too. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading on Consideration Postponed."



Speaker Bradley: "And now, Mrs. Willer, have you worked that out on suspending the rules? Mr. Sandquist?"

Sandquist: "Yes, I believe there's no objection. We've talked to both sides now and that's to waive the posting rule so the four Bills, 621, 622, and 623, 620, so they can be heard in Human Resources this week."

Speaker Bradley: " Does the Lady have leave? The Lady has leave to suspend the posting rule on those four Bills so that they can be heard next week. Leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? Leave. There's been a request for a Fiscal Note on 2955. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. White, on House Bill 958, is it? 958. Read the Bill, Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 958..."

Speaker Bradley: "What Order of the Calendar is that on? "

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act creating the Counselor Registration and Licensure Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "It's on Third Reading. Page eight. Turn on Mr. White, please."

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill will establish requirement standards in our administrative procedures for the counseling profession. Yesterday this Bill was heard in Sunset Committee. There were some recommendations that were made. All this Bill does is it will require anyone who wishes to serve as a counselor meet the educational requirements and be registered with the Department of Registration, Education."

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

Leinenweber: "Yes. I would ask the Gentleman a question. Maybe perhaps Representative Katz. Last year we adopted the Sunset provision which I understand created some kind of a Commission that was supposed to review these occupations which are subject to be licensed. And I wonder whether



or not this Bill which was filed prior to the enactment of the Sunset legislation is in 'synch' with the Sunset legislation. Perhaps Representative Katz could answer the question."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Katz?"

Katz: "Yes. Senate Bill 495, that's the Bill the Gentleman from Joliet mentioned, does not contain any exemption with regard to Bills that were pending. It became effective upon the signature of the Governor and that signature occurred late last year so it was fully effective. It did provide that licensing Bills were supposed to go through a joint select Committee that was set up under House Bill 1944."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I would ask the Sponsor then whether or not this Bill has gone through that joint Committee set up under the Representative... the Bill Representative Katz mentioned."

White: "Yes, Representative. We met yesterday afternoon."

Leinenweber: "And what was their recommendations?"

White: "They did have some recommendations and they said that they'd get back to me later. If the Bill passes the House, I will hold the Bill on Second Reading and await their recommendation."

Leinenweber: "Well, just so the Members know what we're doing here, Illinois probably licenses more professions than any other .. any of the 50 states. We're adding a new occupation here, licensed professional counselor. We're voting on a Bill which probably will be maybe vastly changed or will be... many changes may be recommended by the.. this particular select Committee. So, in a certain respect we're being asked to buy a pig in the poke and I personally plan to vote 'no'."

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

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



on behalf of those of us who were on that regulatory Committee, we did hear this Bill yesterday the same way as we did.... Representative Jaffe's Bill on the dental laboratories. We are consofing. We will have a recommendation before the Bill would get to the Senate. So that I did want you to know that we have considered it."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Mr. White, to close the debate."

White: "Well, I would ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Somebody push my green light back there. Danny O'Brien? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 77 'ayes' and 40 'nays'. This Bill, having failed ... I'm sorry. Mrs. Dyer, the Lady from DuPage. Mrs. Dyer, to explain her vote."

Dyer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to explain my 'yes' vote. I think the Members should think twice before they vote 'no' on this Bill. In present day society full all of its stresses and strains, many, many people go to counselors. They seek counseling of all kinds whether it's marriage counseling, family counsel, or counseling for alcoholism or drug addiction or many, many things that affect many, many families. Now it's a protection to consumers if we set up standards and criteria for education and background and if we can keep the fuzz out of the counseling business. There have been some quacks and frauds in this field. I think this is the greatest assurance that there would be high standards of educational background and credentially. I would like to see 12 more 'yes' votes up there." It's a good Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from



Cook, Mr. Huskey, to explain his vote."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to explain my 'yes' vote.

This Bill should be given a chance in the Senate. This Bill certainly has got a lot of merits to it. And you people that are voting... voting red up there, I think you should reconsider. The ones that are voting 'present' ... that are not voting at all, you should reconsider this. Give this Bill a chance and let them... let them make it a real good Bill because it's got so much good merit, you're doing an injustice not voting and giving this Bill a 'yes' vote. "

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, the last two speakers changed my mind. Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright. The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent, 'aye'. Wikoff 'aye'. Hannig 'aye'. Okay. Balanoff 'aye'. What's the... Let's dump the Roll Call. And take another vote. The question is, 'Shall 958 pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Alright. Everybody on there? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 96 'aye's and 34 'no's. Mulcahey wishes to be recorded 'aye'. On this question there are 96 'aye's and 34 'no's. And Mr. Simms wants a... requests a verification of the Roll. Mr. Bluthardt, for what purpose do you arise?"

Bluthardt: "Purpose of an inquiry. If we're playing, you know, best out of three, why this is still a tie. We've got another Roll Call coming."

Speaker Bradley: "Verification has been requested. The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl, for what purpose do you arise?"

Stiehl: "Vote me 'aye' please."

Speaker Bradley : "Please record her as voting 'aye'. Mr. White?"



White: "Request for a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Bradley: "A request for the poll of the absentees.
Poll.. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees; Abramson. Beatty.
Bell. Bullock. Capuzi..."

Speaker Bradley: "Bullock 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Casey. Darrow. Deuster. Ebbesen. Epton..."

Speaker Bradley: "Dave Jones, 'aye'... Oh, Dave Jones wants
to be verified. That alright, Mr. Simms? Dave Jones?
Fine. Alright. Must be a... Mrs. Oblinger wishes to
be verified, Mr. Simms. Oblinger. Alright. Proceed
with the..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing with the poll of the absentees;
Flinn. Getty. Griesheimer. Jaffe. Johnson. Emil
Jones. Karpziel. Klosak. Laurino. Marovitz. McBroom.
Meyer. Molloy. Mugalian. Pechous. Peters. Pierce.
Robbins. Ryan. Satterthwaite. Schlickman. Schneider.
..."

Speaker Bradley: "Darrow votes 'no'. Darrow, Clarence Darrow."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schoeberlein. Schuneman. Stearney. E.G. Steele
Taylor. Telcser. VonBoeckman. Walsh. Williams.
Winchester. And, J.J. Wolf."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Simms?"

Simms: "We want to proceed with the verification, now. Would
it be alright if one of the Members maybe to expedite
things could come up there to your chair? You know,
there's seven... if there's not 96 people that are voting
for it... There's seven.."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman.."

Simms: "Members in the back. They're seats are empty..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, for
what purpose do you arise?"

Lechowicz: "I accept this challenge. I'll come up there.
What do we start with, Gerry?"

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon?"



Lechowicz: "What's the count?"

Speaker Bradley: "99 'aye'."

Lechowicz: "The Gentleman withdraws his request for a verification, right?"

Simms: "No, I retain it."

Speaker Bradley: "You want the Affirmative called? We just polled the absentees. You want.."

Simms: "I want to proceed with the..."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright. The Clerk will call the Affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ackerman. Alexander. Anderson. Balanoff. Barnes. Bianco. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Brummer. Bullock. Burnidge. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Conti. Cullerton. Currie. Daniels. Davis. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Ewell. Farley. Virginia Frederick. Gaines. Garmisa. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hallstrom. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Hoffman. Huff. Huskey. Dave Jones. Keane. Kelly. Kent. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Macdonald. Madigan. Mahar. Margulas. Matijevich. Matula. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McMaster. McPike. Mulcahey. Murphy. Oblinger. O'Brien. Patrick. Piel. Polk. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Reed. Richmond. Ronan. Sandquist. Schisler. Sharp. Slape. Steczko. C.M. Stiehl. Stuffle Terzich. Van Duyne. Vinson. Vitek. White. Wikoff. Willer. Williamson. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Schraeder wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. And Vinson wishes to go from 'aye' to 'no'."

Simms: "What figure do we start out at, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "99 'aye'. Questions of the Affirmative Roll."

Simms: "Representative Alexander?"

Speaker Bradley: "Alexander? She's back there."



Simms: "Representative Birchler?"

Speaker Bradley: "He's always there."

Simms: "Representative Bowman? He's there. Representative Brummer?"

Speaker Bradley: "He's there."

Simms: "Representative Dawson?"

Speaker Bradley: "He's there."

Simms: "Representative DiPrima?"

Speaker Bradley: "DiPrima? He's not in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Simms: "Representative Domico?"

Speaker Bradley: "Domico? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Simms: "Representative Ewell?"

Speaker Bradley: "Ewell? How is Ewell recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Simms: "Representative Farley?"

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Farley? I don't see him in his chair. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Simms: "Representative Hanahan?"

Speaker Bradley: "Hanahan? Could Representative Madigan be verified? Standing right here?"

Simms: "Yeah, fine."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay. Hanahan? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Simms: "Representative Huff?"

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Huff? I don't see him back there. How is he recorded?"

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



Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Simms: "Representative Kosinski?"

Speaker Bradley: "Kosinski? He's not in his chair. How is he... Yes, he's over here.. There he is."

Simms: "Okay. Representative Kulas?"

Speaker Bradley: "Kulas is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Simms: "Okay. Representative Matijevich?"

Speaker Bradley: "Matijevich is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Simms: "Representative McGrew?"

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute..."

Simms: "Oh, I'm sorry."

Speaker Bradley: "We'd better take him off there. And, McAuliffe? McAuliffe, did you want to go from 'no' to.. He wants to go from 'no' to 'aye'."

Simms: "Representative McGrew?"

Speaker Bradley: "Right here."

Simms: "I see Sam. Okay. Representative McPike?"

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

Simms: "Okay. Representative Patrick?"

Speaker Bradley: "Patrick? I don't see him. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Oh, there he is in the back.."

Simms: "Okay."

Speaker Bradley: "He's here."

Simms: "Representative Polk?"

Speaker Bradley: "Polk?"

Simms: "Yeah."

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentlem... He's not in his seat. How is he recorded?" "Polk. Yes. How's he recorded?"

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



Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Simms: "Representative Preston?"

Speaker Bradley: "He's in his seat. Representative Kucharski,
for what purpose do you arise?"

Kucharski: "Change me from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Kucharski, 'aye'."

Simms: "Representative Rea?"

Speaker Bradley: "He's in Hanahan's seat. Now Polk has
returned to the chamber. Put him back on."

Simms: "Okay. Representative Schisler."

Speaker Bradley: "Schisler? Not in his seat. How is he
recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Simms: "Representative Sharp?"

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Sharp? Not in his chair.
How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Simms: "Representative Slape?"

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Slape? Not in his seat.
He's down in the... Who's that? Terzich's seat. He's
here."

Simms: "Representative Van Duyne?"

Speaker Bradley: "Van Duyne is in his seat."

Simms: "Representative J.J. Wolf?"

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

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

Simms: "I'm sorry. Representative Yourell."

Speaker Bradley: "You want Wolf taken off? Alright. Yourell.
Yourell. He's not in his seat. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Simms: "Representative Doyle?"

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Doyle is in Farley's seat in



the rear of the chamber."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker? Is he still with us or is he ..."

Speaker Bradley: "He's still here."

Simms: "Okay. That's alright. Representative Piel?"

Speaker Bradley: "Piel is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Simms: "Representative... Oh, I'm sorry."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Simms: "Representative Jack Davis?"

Speaker Bradley: "He's in his seat. Further questions?"

Simms: "Representative Pechous?"

Speaker Bradley: "Piel is down here. Put Piel back on.

Representative Pechous is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

Simms: "He didn't vote. Okay. "

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

Simms: "Did we take off Representative Ewell?"

Speaker Bradley: "Ewell has been taken off the Roll. And Mr.

VonBoeckman wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'.

Further questions?"

Simms: "No further questions."

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

Schuneman: "Would you record me as 'no' please, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "Alright. What's the total? Mr. Jaffe wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Schneider 'aye'. On this question there are 93 'aye's, 34 'no's. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1404, Mr. McMaster."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1404...a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Enviornmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

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



the House, House Bill 1404 is aimed at correcting and improving the judicial review of the Pollution Control Board order and rule making and various proceedings. The Pollution Control Board is the only state agency from which appeals go directly to the Appellate Court. These courts are accustomed to reviewing questions of law and well developed factual records. Since the Appellate Court relies on the record to make a determination, more decisions which have no basis in fact have been allowed to stand. House Bill 1404 would mandate the Pollution Control Board to base its decisions on evidence in the record rather than on personal beliefs and feelings. For that reason, I would urge passage of this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I don't know of any piece of legislation that has ever been constructed to deal with the emotions and feelings and attitudes of an agency, much less the Environmental Protection Agency or the Pollution Control Board. What I feel that Tom is trying to do, as he's been doing over the ten years we've been together here, is to once again try to undercut the efforts by the Pollution Control Board to justifiably try to deal with the problems that are presented to them that deal with the environment. Unfortunately, he takes the attitude, I think, that the Pollution Control Board does not have the staff or the responsiveness to deal with that. I do think they deal with the facts. I do think they deal within conformity of the law. And those of us who support the law find it probably hard to accept an ocean, that what he's trying to do is to incisively cut away some abstract notion that probably they are reacting out of attitude and feelings. They are



acting out of the law. They are acting out of the evidence before them when they try to enforce the Environmental Protection Agency's rules, regulations, or statutory authority. So I believe this is a bad proposition because it really doesn't deal with reality. It deals with one's leanings and bias' and prejudice for the EPA or toward the Pollution Control Board. I would suggest that if he has a problem with the Pollution Control Board that he draft a Bill or language that is a little bit more precise than the nebulous nest of his explanation in the Bill that he's presented to us. So I think it's a lousy Bill. It's another effort to undercut what remains of the Pollution Control Board's authority to deal with the crisis of pollution in America and in Illinois in particular. So I solicit from you a 'no' vote on 1404."

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

Terzich: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question."

All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's... In the opinion of the Chair, the 'aye's have it. And the Gentleman's motion prevails. McMaster... Representative McMaster to close the debate."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill seeks to amend Section 41 of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act by stating that any final order or determination of the Board under this Act shall be based solely on the evidence in the record of the particular proceeding involved. And any such final order or determination shall be invalid if it is against the manifest weight of the evidence. And I think this is specific and in complete reverse of what Representative Schneider said. I do think it is specific and I urge the passage of this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'

All in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, to explain his vote."

Kane: "I wanted to ask the Sponsor a question as to what specific action that the Pollution Control Board has taken that this Bill would negate? I don't know of any."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Borchers, the Gentleman from Macon, to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, ten years ago there were two of us who voted against the Environmental Protection Agency giving all... giving them all the power. The fact is, they make a rule and it's the law under the power we gave them. We should be the ones to decide what the law is, not them. But they do it and you.. and the people that are at the head of the Pollution Control Board and Environmental Protection Agency are overwhelmingly on the side of what they think not on the evidence, of what they think is right from their point of view. They give no one another opportunity to have an opposing view. This is a very good Bill. These people are very prejudice. They do not judge things fairly. They cause people to have to go to Appellate Court under a great deal of cost expense. What we should do is make them be as a Judge would be, fair in what they do in their dealings. But they think they are the law. And they're not. We should be the law. The courts should be the law. And they do not hold fairly as in a court of law should be, on the evidence. I have no time to tell you all the stories I know about these and actual facts and cases over the state. But I've been very interested and watching for years of what they're doing. "

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, to



explain his vote."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1404 I believe should pass. It got a long hearing in the House Environmental, Energy and Natural Resources Committee, passed out all to nothing. Now if you look in your Digests, it's a simple matter that the Pollution Control Board must make decisions upon the evidence and they are prohibited from making decisions against the manifest weight of the evidence presented to the Pollution Control Board. Now, how can the Membership or anybody really be against that kind of proceeding in the Pollution Control Board? All it basically is, is they have to make a decision upon the evidence and they cannot make a decision against the manifest weight of the evidence. And I think for those two reasons, which is basically the Bill, I think Thomas McMaster has a good Bill and it passed out of our Committee overwhelmingly and I'd ask you to support it."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "We've already done that. We're on explanation of votes. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. ... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Now .. Mrs. Currie to explain her vote."

Currie: "Representative McClain suggested all this is say the Pollution Control Board has to follow the manifest weight of the evidence in making rules and regulations. Already the Pollution Control Board operates under tighter standards of evidence, tighter requirements for explaining its rules and regulations than any other state agency. Either this Bill is meaningless, either it already says what the Pollution Control Board should do what the Pollution Control Board already does, or



this Bill opens a Pandora's Box in which a court may well find that the Legislature must have intended to gut the rule making powers of the Pollution Control Board. Illinois has a strong environmental program. I think this kind of legislation if it isn't altogether without meaning, is one that will.. that will destroy the program that we already have and that we should be proud of. Earth Day was this week..."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish?"

Currie: "... For you to vote 'yes' on this Bill. Earth Day ten years ago..."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 102 'aye's, 34 'nay's. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2028."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2028..."

Speaker Bradley: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

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

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

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2028 indexes Public Aid subsidies. It provides for annual adjustments of Public Aid consistent with the changes in the CPI, Consumer Price Index. It is, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a matter of simple equity. It would assure that Public Aid assistance would receive the same kind of adjustments that other components of the budget now enjoy. I would point out that since 196...1974 when the flat grant system went into place, the cost of living has increased by 54% in this coun.. in this state. The amount of the subsidies for Public Aid recipients however, has only increased by 10% in that same period of time. Five percent two years ago and five percent last year. The effect, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is that the



people, the children, the aged, blind, and the elderly who are now getting public assistance in this state, are in effect getting less money now, less ability to survive now than we gave them in 1974. Now, each year this Legislature goes through the trauma of debate on raises for public assistance. This legislation if passed would avoid that trauma and would set in place a mechanism for regular consideration of the issue by the agency charged with enforcement of the Public Aid Code. There is precedent, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the Public Aid Code for annual review of .. and adoption of the.. and adjustments, rather, of the level of public assistance. So far there has not been those regular adjustments even though I would point out that Section 12-4.1-11 of the Code does provide for allowances adjusted annually by the finding of the surveys conducted by the department. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I encourage your 'aye' vote on this legislation to.. to put into place a mechanism for such adjustments that are already in the Code, I believe, or already suggested by the Code and which is so badly needed by the people in this state that depend on Public Aid as their only means of subsistence."Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Dwyne."

Van Dwyne: "I would... Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I don't even know if anybody's paying attention or whether anybody really cares or not, but I think that they should at least from my point of view be forewarned. Last year, and the year before when Corneal Davis was here on the floor and we were talking about Public Aid recipients, we had one heck of a time even trying to get them to five point five or the five percent increase. If they'll read their Digests and if



their Digests are correct, this puts the Public Aid recipients in the same category as anybody else as the cost of living increase. The Fiscal Note says that... Well, it's somewhere between eight point four million to ten million and etc. and then these percentage increase will equate to 90 million dollars and 72.6 million for '79 and 1980 respectively. I think if you want to vote for the Bill, that's fine. Everybody has their own powers of persuasion and their own convictions, but at least you shouldn't sit there in your chair and not know what the hell is happening."

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

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. What we're doing here is the same thing that Congress has already done for those who are on Social Security. I think it's only fair that we help the people in these type of ... times of inflation, that really need it and cannot help themselves. This is a good Bill and if we can give away that 70 million to the so-called middle income and rich that we do in the inheritance tax last night, we certainly can support the poor people and I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hope you will notice that what this Bill is asking for is that there will be an automatic increase in monthly Public Aid payments, indexing those payments according to the Consumer Price Index. The fiscal impact on this is staggering, in the hundreds of millions of dollars and I hope you will take that into account before you lock this state into this kind of commitment which we will not be able to meet and then we will have to tell those people, we're sorry, but we couldn't do what we said we were going to do when we passed this Bill in 1980. This is indexing of Public Aid payment, Ladies and Gentlemen. I urge you defeat this Bill."



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

Leinenweber: "I just had a couple of questions for the Sponsor."

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates she'll yield."

Leinenweber: "Mrs. Braun, as I understand it, at least for the first few months of 1980 the Carter administration has announced that the Department of Labor under the Carter administration has announced that our inflation rate is approximately 18%. If that keeps up for the balance of this year, through the election, then this would provide for an 18% increase. Is that correct?"

Braun: "It would require for adjustment to be made consistent with the Consumer Price Index. It would not... It would not as I understand it, tie the Bill lock, stock and barrel to those.. to the CPI."

Leinenweber: "The other... The other question I would have.."

Braun: "I would point out also, Mr. Leinenweber, that it's an annual increase, not a monthly increase as suggested."

Leinenweber: "I understand. I said if it continued on the basis that it has for the last few months, it would be 18% if that was the case, then it would be 18%. Is that correct?"

Braun: "I'm sorry, Mr. Leinenweber..."

Leinenweber: "Well, it kept up at one and a half percent for a month as it has.... And what would that fiscally cost the state if that was the case, if it was 18%?"

Braun: "Well, I'd need a calculator, Mr. Leinenweber, to figure that, but I would point out..."

Leinenweber: "You have one big enough?"

Braun: "I would say... I would say to you... I would say to you that.. that, you know, we all the bear the cost of inflation. We have not yet found a magic formula in this country to take it to... to cure that ill. However, the people who are recipients of Public Assistance have the least ability to deal with the inflationary effects in our economy, have to live on the least amount



of money and all that this would do would be to put them in a position... similarly situate them with other segments of the state economy so they would be eligible for increases that are routinely granted in other parts of the Public Aid budget and other parts of the state budget."

Leinenweber: "The other question I have; Is your Bill..."

Braun: "I've been offered two calculator, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Does your Bill contemplate making any adjustment in accord with the points the President has recently raised that Consumer Price Index does not necessarily accurately reflect the rate of inflation? For example, one of the major components, as I understand it, for the great increase in these first few months of 1980 has been interest on mortgages. Now, it would seem to me that most Public Aid recipients would not be in a position of taking out mortgages while they're on Public Aid. Consequently, that particular item in the so-called market basket would not included. So it would seem to me that they would be getting an increase excessive of the actual rate of inflation for the items that they continually buy."

Braun: "Mr. Leinenweber, I would... Representative Leinenweber, I would respond by saying that that is a misconception that we're talking about raising the level of assistance by the amount of the CPI. What it says is that there should be adjustments made based upon those increases so that if there were an 18% increase, for example, it would be within the discretion of the department to determine what percentage should be given. But it would turn it over to the Department and not make it a matter that has to be taken up every time in this chamber where other kinds of considerations sometimes occur. We all went through the trauma of the... of the Public Aid Bill this last time. What this would do



would be to put it into the agency that's in charged with administration of this... of this Act and allow them to make the adjustments based on that. If the CPI went down, Mr. ... Representative Leinenweber, if it were actually to decrease, then it.. then it would be possible for the department to decrease the level of assistance. I think we would all welcome the day when the CPI went down. But this Bill allows for the department to make the adjustment one way or the other based upon, but not tied to, the CPI."

Leinenweber: "Well, based upon the present administration, I would not feel that that would ever come about. However, I do realize that there is an election coming up and perhaps the next President of the United States will see that it comes back down to where it was when President Ford was there."

Braun: "Mr. Leinenweber? Representative Leinenweber, I've lived under Republican and Democratic administrations. I've never seen it go down in my lifetime."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, in order to save the time of the House, if this reaches 89 votes, I'm going to ask for a verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Hearing no further discussion, Braun, to close the debate."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill raises an issue of simple fairness. I call for a favorable response for the many people all across this state and I want to emphasize, there are people all across the state who depend on Public Assistance for their livelihood, for the children, the blind, the disabled, who can look to no one else but us for their livelihood. This Bill allows the agency which is charged with administering the Public Assistance program in this state to make the adjustments on a regular basis. It's.. That's all that it provides for, is that adjust-



ments be made on a regular basis. It does not specify the amount of that adjustment. It does not tie the amount of that adjustment. I urge your favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'

All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, to explain his vote for one minute."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Representative from Chicago does bring to this House a very serious subject which we will have to sooner or later come to grips with and that is the manner in which we deal with the payments that the state does make to those individuals that receive welfare from the state of one kind or another. It is a very serious problem. It is serious to the people receiving welfare. It is serious to the taxpayers of the state who have to foot the tab and it certainly is traumatic to the Members of the General Assembly who every year are faced with that subject. I am not certain, however, that.. and I know at least in my mind, that the statute presented by the Representative for our consideration today is the right way to go. It locks in and fixes in irrespective of what the other fiscal needs and conditions of the state might be and let me just indicate, Representative Leinenweber indicated the cost. For everyone percent increase in the Consumer Price Index, if this Bill should pass, there would be a ten million dollar tab for the state. So that in 1979, the added costs would have been 112 million. In 1980, added costs of 132 million, in 1981 added costs of 112 million dollars. The Treasury regardless of whether you.. whose figures you believe in terms of surpluses, this cannot stand that kind of built-in.. built-in activity in terms of taking money out of the Treasury. Representative Braun is absolutely correct in



that we have to come to grips in what we do in this area. But I respectfully suggest to you that although her motivations are correct and I agree with the way she is moving, I suggest to you that in terms of where we are today, and what we have to deal with today, we cannot ... we cannot allow this to pass. Thank you."

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

Birkinbine: "Well, it's not so much to explain as I had a question of the Sponsor. When you were answering Representative Leinenweber's comment, you said that they would not be guided by the CPI. They had flexibility?"

Speaker Bradley: "I'm sorry. We're past that time."

Birkinbine: "Alright."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Gaines, to explain his vote for one minute."

Gaines: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also want to allude to some of the things ... one of the questions that has been asked earlier about ... saying that the mortgage rate would not affect this. Well, I've been both a landlord and a tenant in my lifetime and whenever the cost of housing goes up it's passed along to the tenants and the recipients are certainly tenants. So anything that raises the index based on housing costs is passed along to the recipients even though they're not buying. They are renting. And the Public Aid Department has to come up with the money to pay for the rent. So therefore, if the biggest portion is in housing, that portion will also be passed on to the recipients."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 47 'aye's, 64 'nay's, 11 voting 'present'. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. On page 16, under Constitutional Amendments, Second



Reading is HJR 46. Mr. Friedrich?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #46, this Resolution has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. HJR 43."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #43, this Resolution has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, O'Brien, amends House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #43 on page three, line 14 by changing '60' to '75'."

Speaker Bradley: "O'Brien? Is the Gentleman on the floor? The Gentleman's not on the floor. Mr. Vinson? Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. O'Brien spoke with me about this Amendment. I am in agreement with his purpose and intent on this and told him that I would handle it for him if he were not on the floor at the appropriate time and I would move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Amendment. Mr. Kane, from Sangamon, on the Amendment."

Kane: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe that anybody other than the Sponsor of the Amendment can handle the Amendment. I think the only thing we can do is table that Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Are you a Co-Sponsor of the Amendment, Mr. Vinson?"

Vinson: "I'm not a Co-Sponsor, but he did ask me to handle it if he was not here."

Kane: "I don't think that cuts the mustard, Mr. Speaker."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask for leave to be a Co-Sponsor."

Kane: "Objection."

Speaker Bradley: "Objections have been heard."



Vinson: "I would move that I be added as a Co-Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Kane: "I don't think that's a proper motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "He's defending the rights of the Members on Amendments. Really our rules are not clear on that particular issue, but the practice has been that the Member be here when the Amendment has been moved and we will continue that practice, so the only solution... or option to Mr. Vinson is to move the suspension of that rule and would take 89 votes... Well, if 89 Members want to suspend that... and permit him to become a Co-Sponsor I don't know that we have anything that says that can't be done. Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Well, I think unless the Sponsor of the Amendment or the Bill is here, we don't know whether he wants... I assume that he may not even want the Amendment considered if he's not here. I think the only motion that.. I think the only thing you can do is withdraw that Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Chair's only alternative is to be aware that Mr. Vinson is suggesting he has talked with the Member who has the Amendment and there's an agreement with it and something's been worked out."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker? We're all here. I think the Members that are here are entitled to the courtesy of the House and it's been extended before. If the Member is not here to offer his Amendment, the only thing that can happen is that it must be withdrawn."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kane, you're absolutely correct. We'll leave it on Second Reading until Mr. O'Brien is here. And we'll take it up Tuesday unless there are further Amendments, why don't we just leave it on.. You want to go with the other Amendments. If they're not in conflict then we'll go... Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Telcser, amends House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 43 on page one, line



31 and 32 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #2

simply provides that the Members of the House are elected in the same fashion they are now and I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Brummer, question on the Amendment."

Brummer: "Yes, I have.. First of all, have these Amendments been distributed?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, they have been."

Brummer: "Okay. Secondly, can you amend a Resolution.. a Constitutional Resolution in light of... I think Constitutional provisions that require that it be read in its entirety some three times? Having read this into the record yesterday and now we amend it, does it need to be read again in its entirety as amended..?"

Speaker Bradley: "It would have to be read three times again as amended."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion on the Amendment? Mr. Hannig? Mr. Hannig."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Hannig: "Yes, reading my copy of the Amendment, it says, 'in Representative elections, including those for nomination, the elector may cast three votes for one candidate or distribute them equally among two or three candidates.' The way I interpret that, that would mean that in a primary election, you could actually vote for three candidates. Is that correct?"

Telcser: "Representative, you could do that now if you're legislative Committee wants to nominate three."

Hannig: "But in a case where a Committee would only nominate two... would..."

Telcser: "Then you could only distribute it equally among the



two. You can give three to one candidate or one and a half to two as we do now."

Hannig: "So, this Amendment would not change the present system of nomination?"

Telcser: "Correct."

Hannig: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Yes, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Question of the Sponsor of the Amendment. If this makes no change, Art, why are we doing it?"

Telcser: "So that there's no question, Representative, as to how the Members of the House would be elected."

Kane: "Has there a question been raised in the last ten years?"

Telcser: "The question is always raised."

Kane: "Not on this particular question, is there?"

Telcser: "Pardon?"

Kane: "Not on this particular issue."

Telcser: "I'm not quite sure of your question, Doug."

Kane: "Has anybody ever raised the question under the 1970 Constitution that we can't have cumulative voting?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr... For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, arise?"

Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think I can answer the Gentleman's question with perfection."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Telcser, do you yield to Mr. Conti?"

Telcser: "Yeah, I yield to Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Last ten years I had to file a suit... and the last four years I had to file a suit where I was the only candidate and one of those famous rulings of Stanley Cusper says the fact that I was the only candidate, I only got a vote and a half. So all he's doing is clarifying it, what vote you should get. Well, all the other three candidates at the same election got a cumulative vote of three. And I ended up with one and a half."



Speaker Bradley : "Further questions? Hearing none, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser:"There may be a problem in the form of the Amendment.
We'd better hold I...."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Telcser. There's some serious problems with that Amendment. Representative Vinson, I think. As long as we're going to hold it for O'Brien, let's just hold the whole thing until they get it straightened out. Alright. Take that one out of the record. House Bill 331, Mr. Kornowicz."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 331, a Bill for an Act to enact the Illinois Pull Tabs and Jar Games Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman..."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker?"

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

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 331 creates an Illinois Pull Tabs and Jar Game Act. The Department of Revenue to issue the license of certain non-profit organizations, conducting the pull tabs and jar games. This is a part-time game for the senior citizens. Let's make it legal. The organizations operating raffles are, at the present time, in violation. The annual fee is \$50.00. Five percent of the net proceeds are to go to the common school fund. Ten dollars for a special permit and single pull tabs and jar games. You must be a bonified organization existing at least for two years. It should be a civic, religious or charitable, social and scouting labor and fraternal or... education or veteran organization. To be excluded are the professional gamblers or gambling promoters. A license fee shall be paid in general revenue funds. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is... Mr. Simms, from Winnebago."

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



I rise in opposition against this Bill. Very frankly, all we're doing is continuing the spread of legalized gambling within the State of Illinois and no matter how you illustrate it, this legislation enters into that. I think the majority of citizens of Illinois have had enough of the proposed gambling limitations and legalized gambling only causes a deterioration and it causes the lessening of the moral fiber of our society. And for these reasons, House Bill 331 should be overwhelmingly defeated."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

Kornowicz: "Yes."

Ewing: "How much revenue do you anticipate this will raise?"

Kornowicz : "This will raise at least three and a half to four million dollars and it won't cost the state anything because the same inspectors, revenue inspectors, that inspect bingo will inspect the raffles and chances. This was told by... to me by the revenue.."

Ewing: "And where does this money go that we..."

Kornowicz: "The five percent goes to the common school fund and the \$50.00 goes to the general revenue."

Ewing: "Would you be willing to take this back for an Amendment so we could allocate that to the Chrysler Bill? Would you, Mr. Sponsor, would you be willing to take this back so we could put it on Chrysler?"

Kornowicz: "No."

Ewing: "Well, I didn't hear the answer."

Kornowicz: "No."

Ewing: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "No further discussion? The Gentleman... The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The



Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, to explain his vote."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we all know that in bingo games in churches and school areas that have these bingo games, they also have raffles and chances. These are the pull jar games and what have you. They are participated by many Members of the community who attend these bingo sessions. All we're doing is we're trying to legalize the practice that is already going on, putting some money into the general revenue fund, in the common school fund without costing the state any additional money. We have had success on a bingo program. It has been controlled. It has been governed, legalized and what have you and this is only an extension of that and I know that Ralph Dunn is quivering over there with anticipation to vote for this particular Bill. It will be definitely controlled by the state. It will be participating and we will be legalizing something that has been tolerated and let go all of these years and I would urge your support. We need 19 good men to vote 'yes' on this."

Speaker Bradley : "Have all voted who wish?.."

Terzich: "And women. I'm sorry about that.."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 77 'aye's and 41 'no's. And the Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees. The Gentleman requests that it be put on.. placed on Postponed Consideration. We'll place it on Postponed Consideration. House Bill 2710."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2710, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation of orthopedic and prosthetic practice, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Garmisa: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I can't understand the antipathy of this General Assembly for any further licensing of any professions or of any occupations, however, we do have one profession that certainly is in terrible need of regulation and of licensing. The fields of prosthetics and orthotics... deals with the design, the fabrication, and the fitting of all types of braces that pertain to the human anatomy and the ability of the human anatomy to function. And we've got to be able to properly assist these patients with the proper brace or the prosthesis that is properly designed for...specifically for their need, whether it be for polio, muscular distrophy, multiple sclerosis, any of these diseases that would cripple a human being,...fractures, traumatic injuries, birth defects, or even the loss of any limb. In the State of Illinois there are approximately 1,500,000 that are...there are about 1,500,000 that are affected by one or more of these conditions that I've named. Now these people put their trust into their physician and the team that the physician involves himself with to handle their treatment. Unfortunately though, there are many individuals involved in the handling of orthopedic and incapacitated patients who have not had proper background and training to enable them to perform a high level function in this particular field. The service that's delivered to the patient in all too many cases is substandard, and this causes a great hardship on the patient and makes for a far longer rehabilitation process than is really necessary to say nothing of the amount of suffering that the patient must endure because of inadequacies on the part of those delivering these services to the patient.



Now the State of Illinois, through its services it provides to the public aid patients and to the Medicare Supplement Program, unfortunately is spending several hundred thousand dollars a year for rehabilitating these patients and in many cases, the tax payers are getting the short end of the stick, and certainly the patients are. At this point, there is no regulatory agency in this state or anywhere in the nation that has any control or regulatory effect on the people who are involved in the delivery of the health care system of orthotics and prosthetics. Now it's not our purpose, but House Bill 2710 to eliminate people who are already gainfully employed in the field of orthotics and prosthetics, it is our purpose to educate these people by making it mandatory they attend training seminars and teaching programs to update their education on a yearly basis. It is the purpose of this Bill to set up an examining Committee designated by the Governor and this should include members of the medical profession, physicians, consumers, patients, and the members of the office of Education and Regulation so that we can maintain high standards for the people who are involved in delivering this type of health care system. We feel that you as Legislators can do a great service for the handicapped of the State of Illinois by instituting legislation that will bring about a licensure Act for orthotics and prosthetics. Not only will you be serving the present generation, but also that of future generations to come. You'd be doing them a great service by enacting this legislation to protect their welfare and their ability to be rehabilitated and make a living and not become dependent upon the tax dollars and the welfare benefits for the taxpayers of this state. I urge a green light on this very important legislation."

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

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the distinguished Gentleman from Cook has just indicated that he



cannot understand why there is a distrust of licensing in this General Assembly, at least the distrust that used to exist in this General Assembly. Today we seem to be passing these things very rapidly, and I thought maybe I would enlighten the Gentleman on why there is a distrust of licensing since he asked the question. The interesting thing is that the orthopedic patients or the handicapped have not come to the General Assembly. They never come to the General Assembly. The ones that come to the General Assembly are the dealers, the business people in this field, and they are the one...the ones who come here, and they want to set up a licensing system. Now the reason that they like to set up the licensing system is that it enables them to limit entry into the particular field. And if you limit entry into a particular field, it is only a matter of time until prices rise. Now one thing that was very interesting in what the Gentleman said, he told us about the terrible things that go on in this field, but the next thing that he added was, he said that all of those people who are already gainfully employed in the field will continue to be gainfully employed. In other words, the grandfather in everyone who is already there, and all of those dreadful people he was telling us about that justifies this kind of legislation, will continue to be doing that same sort of thing, only they will now have the imprimatur of the State of Illinois, I assume, since they are a licensed person, and therefore, we've put some kind of blessing. But there is an additional thing that they would have now limiting entry into the field, they will soon be able to raise prices for those poor handicapped people about whom the Gentleman seemed so concerned. Now the Gentleman spoke about the fact that handicapped people could trust their physician, and indeed they can trust their physician, and there's a very simple way to solve this kind of problem. Namely not to set up the licensure structure unto which you are going to limit entry



into the field and give the control of this field to the people who practice in the field, but all the handicapped person has to do is ask his orthopedic surgeon, or ask his physician, and I'm very sure that his physician will be able to recommend to him good people in the field. The fact of the matter is that the federal government about whom the Gentleman said they were having problems with with unlicensed practitioners is opposed to licensure. they have always been very skeptical of licensure and the only people who are very much in favor of licensure are the people who run to the General Assembly, namely, they are the people in this business, and they want us to give them a monopoly. We are the only ones who can do that. If they try to do it themselves, they will be in violation of the Federal Anti-Trust Act. But by getting the Legislature...Legislators to come in and to act for them, they can legally have a monopoly in the United States without being in violation of the Anti-Trust Act. And so if you want to do a great service to the consumers of Illinois, then let the free enterprise system work for the consumers in Illinois. Let people who want a good orthotist go to their orthopedic man who is treating them and recommend them. And do not set up a structure in Illinois that will enable the people in this business to be able to establish a monopoly and increase prices which they inevitably will once other people cannot enter the field in the way that would normally be the case. And I would urge that this fine Bill be defeated, and you would do a great service to the people of the state."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First of all, I would like to respectfully disagree with my colleague from the 1st District when he says the handicapped don't come to the Legislature. I am here to prove that I did come to the Legislature, and the reason I came is because I had a



qualified orthotist who made the kind of brace that made it possible for me to walk. I was told I would have been in a wheelchair the rest of my life by doctors. And I want to tell you, a podiatrist that I met in California told me the best thing I could do was to get in touch when I got home with a good orthotist. Please...you know, I can understand all the legal rhetoric that goes on around here. In fact, I guess I can say I don't understand it, but please for once look at the needs of people. There are so many people out there who now have had strokes who used to stay at home. They thought that they should be fitted for the rest of their lives. I want to tell you, this profession has made so many people be able to walk. And I'm one of them, and I would so appreciate your 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook,...Mr. Garmisa to close the debate."

Garmisa: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the speaker that spoke in opposition to House Bill 2710 evidently abhors the licensure of any profession. Would he suggest that lawyers should not be licensed? That physicians should not be licensed? That the people that operate on a human being should not be licensed? The people that make artificial limbs under the present system could be just a carpenter with a saw and a hammer and working in a shop under conditions that are absolutely intolerable. And let me further state that when he says that there's no one in this General Assembly that comes to the General Assembly asking them for the licensure of these people is absolutely a false statement. Now the way I got into this Licensure Act is through an oblique manner because one of our former colleagues had the loss of a limb about ten years ago. That was Representative Bill 'Barr'. I have been through nine operations with Bill all over the state, in every state in the union practically to the highest institutes of learn-



ing where there was nobody that actually would know how to fit properly a limb or an attachment to a human body. Now we in Illinois, we license horseshoers. We license blacksmiths and they're attaching a supplement to an animal. But what we have to talk about putting on something belonging to a human being...that licensure then is out of order according to the last opponent to this Bill. There is a great need for the people in this state to have a properly licensed prothesist when he goes to get fit for a limb for any part of his body for a brace he's sorely in need of, and Dolly Hallstrom can testify to that, and every Member of this General Assembly should certainly give an 'aye' vote to this very much needed legislation."

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

Leinenweber: "Yeah, there's one thing that I don't know if it was pointed out, that makes this a doubly bad Bill, and that is although it appears to provide that a group appointed by the Department of Registration will actually control entry into this field. If you look on page five of the Bill, a requirement to get into this field under paragraph C, a successful completion of the American Board for a certification examination in orthotics and prosthetics, which means that total control over admission in this field or total veto is in the hands of a private outfit controlled 100% by the people that are already making money in this field. I think it is a bad Bill. It is a terrible approach. We...maybe you shouldn't always listen to Representative Katz, but he's absolutely right on this one."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Dunn to explain his vote."



Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Chair...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I want to kind of echo Dolly Hallstrom's sentiments, too. My wife had a stroke about three and a half years ago, and due to the fact that we found a good brace man, orthotic man was able to help her after taking her to California and three or four other places. She's walking, doing a pretty good job. I sat in the Sunset Committee yesterday and heard former Representative Bill 'Barr' testify as to the problems that he had after he lost his leg in an automobile explosion...bomb explosion in his automobile, how that he had to try six or seven or artificial limbs before he finally found someone. He is one of those that advocate as I do, and as Mrs... Representative Hallstrom does, add Sparky, that these people have a chance to keep this Bill alive at least so that we can decide...Sunset Committee is going to decide whether it is a good Bill or not, or whether they're going to recommend it or not. They will do that in the next week or two. We went to them yesterday, had quite a bit of testimony, and we heard from other people who thought that they had been...had bad braces because the field's not regulated. If you look in the Springfield paper, a Springfield telephone directory, yellow pages, if you want an artificial hand, or an artificial leg, or an artificial limb, just look in the yellow pages and you can go buy one from a chain store just like you'd buy a pair of gloves or a pair of shoes. If you think that doesn't need regulating, why I certainly differ with you. I think that this is something important, and while there's not many here now, I certainly urge that you help us by keeping the Bill alive so we can send it over to the Senate. And if the Sunset Committee decides it is not needed, I'm sure it will not get out of Rules, or out of the Senate."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun to explain her vote for one minute, and we're...we'll...try to keep it



within a minute or I'm going to have to start using the timer."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I won't go on at length. I normally support Sunset concepts. I have supported it consistently. However, my mother just recently in the last year underwent a stroke. She had to find a good brace person. We were fortunate that she did find someone. She has not done as well as Dolly Hallstrom; but I can certainly support the statement made by Sparky Garmisa, and Dolly Hallstrom in this regard and urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Garmisa to explain his vote. Mr. Robbins, what purpose do you rise?"

Robbins: "I wish to explain my vote..."

Speaker Bradley: "Well..."

Robbins: "...Because I feel that this is...I can't?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Skinner said you couldn't. Mr. Garmisa, Mr. Garmisa, do you want to yield?"

Garmisa: "I'll yield to Mr. Robbins."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, Mr. Robbins, Mr. Garmisa says you can."

Robbins: "You mean...you mean you can't explain your vote any more?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, you can explain your vote. Yes, Sir."

Robbins: "I'm voting for this Bill because of the people that I have met that are handicapped. We spend all kinds of money on different kinds of handicaps in the state. Let's see to it that the...they have a way to cure some of their problems, and let's vote this Bill on out. Put another green light or two on there and give us a chance to see whether we can make this work or not. If it don't work, why we can always do away with the license."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald to explain her vote."

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



House. I couldn't have been more eloquent than Dolly Hallstrom and certainly Representative Garmisa has explained this Bill very well, and as my good friend, Benny Epton, who isn't here this afternoon would always say, possibly there is a conflict of interest. But my husband happens to have an artificial limb, and I will tell you that we have spent over the years of our marriage some very important dollars in when we were trying to educate our children, on prosthesis that were not fit properly, and this is indeed a very, very important Bill economically to the people who are handicapped and need the protection of a Bill of this kind. And I urge you to think what you're doing to the handicapped by denying them the right to have qualified people who are serving them. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Piel, the Gentleman from Cook to explain his vote."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm voting for this because I have a sister who has a brace on, and I was very surprised, you know, when she got her brace, the time that they have to spend in the doctor's office, getting the brace fit...fitted, getting the shoes fitted, and one thing or another. It is not something that you just slap a brace on and hope the person walks right. There is a lot of hard work that goes into the job of fitting a person's brace and shoe to go along with it. I don't think this type of a job should be given to somebody with sort of a 'schloch' reputation, and I would ask for more green votes. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Bullock to explain his vote."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill both out of respect for the Sponsor and certain great admiration for one of the Co-Sponsors. I am glad to see the sentiment in this House on the issue of human need and compassion, and I would hope that for many



of those persons who need devices that have been enunciated, and there are some of them who need governmental subsidy in form of public aid and medical assistance, and this is an issue of great human need, and we're sharing our support by casting the vote for that. And there are other issues of equal human need that have come before this Body, and I hope that some of the persons would show the same type of empathy for those individuals who might not be physically incapacitated but are socially incapacitated as a result of their stations in life."

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

Vitek: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Look at that Board up there. 72 people not voting. Does that indicate that we have a quorum in this House? I'm going to make a movement after this that we adjourn."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stanley, what purpose do you rise? Mr. Ryan...is recorded as voting 'aye'. On this question then there are 92 'ayes', 18 'nays', this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1823."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1823, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Donovan."

Donovan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1823 revises the current requirement for Public Aid recipients to report changes of status with respect to needs, available income, family composition, that might affect eligibility for assistance, requiring monthly reporting rather than annual reporting. The thrust of this Bill is to reduce the high rate of ineligibility error and to improve the management performance of quality control of the program. Failure to comply with the updated monthly reporting would result in a denial or termination of financial aid until information is received. And, at that point, you still have a ten day notice and a 60 day appeal process to go through if you care to. Other states have found this to be very favorable in reducing errors in eligibility and the Federal Government now is promoting such a program with incentives up to 50% cost sharing if you will reduce your error in eligibility below four percent. At this point... at this point in time, as recent as 1979, ineligible and over payments in this state rose as high as 12% and eligible but over payment is still at 6%. Certainly there are segments of this... Certainly there are segments that are stable and their circumstances don't change that often and in Amendment 1 I made provisions for that in allowing the department themselves to waive the monthly requirement. And that would deal mostly with shut-ins, the aged, the blind, the deaf and people like that. But, more only targets... or brings into close scrutiny the areas where there is a lot of change and with this, we find that inheritantly and other states have found anyhow,



that the grants can be increased to most of the people that are indeed eligible for these . . . for these grants. So, at.. plus, keeping tab on the changes on a more timely basis. The Department of Public Aid in its human services data report part one, reported this last year, that it is a good concept and it's found to be very effective. In 1979, fiscal 1979, in a pilot project, they claim that they had found a two million dollar savings. So I would ask that you give favorable consideration for this Bill because it is a good, progressive and cost effective Bill. "

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen?"

Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor some questions please?"

Donovan: "Yes."

Speaker Bradley: "He'll yield."

Pullen: "Was Senate Amendment adopted on this Bill?"

Donovan: "Yes, there was. Just last week, I believe."

Pullen: "The Bill, as it came out of Committee, said that all Public Aid recipients would have to report monthly instead of annually to the local Public Aid Office to verify their eligibility. And some of us have some concerns about that in terms of the elderly and disabled whose status really does not change and I wonder whether you could tell us how the Amendment affects that?"

Donovan: "Well, it allows the Department by really... really by rules to determine the areas and that's particularly the shutins and the blind and the deaf to waive that requirement. That was a concern of theirs and I yielded to that concern."

Pullen: "Is the Department now in support of this Bill?"

Donovan: "They're not against it, I should say that. I don't know if they give me an unqualified support for it. This was their main concern. So I.. I concurred with them."

Pullen: "How many personnel do you think the Department would



have to add to comply with this Bill?"

Donovan: "I'm not... There has been a question of that. I don't know specifically. They tell me that they were embarking on a computer assistance program. I feel that... And I've been told that it would be a very minimal increase with this... coupled with this computer assistance program which HEW is promoting and helping finance if we can get to this four percent level. I'm not.. I don't know the exact number that you're speaking of. But with this computer assistance program they feel that they can get the job done and add very little people to it."

Pullen: "Is the purpose of your Bill to save money by avoiding abuse?"

Donovan: "To cut down on errors and ineligibility is really the primary purpose of the Bill. That would.. It could included abuse."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Hearing none... You wish to poll... Who asked the question? Mr. White?"

White: "Yes. Representative Donovan, a few years ago the Illinois Public Aid Department decided to use the card system whereby they would send out a card, many times the card would get lost in the mail, and my question to you right now, is, 'What system would you use in order to determine eligibility?': to verify eligibility monthly?"

Donovan: "Yeah, they.. They still intend to use the mail system, possibly with tearing off your check and mailing it back. That's the one that's been most... proposed to me most of the time by the department.."

White: "Yeah. Well, I have a problem with this Bill because many times a mail system isn't very reliable and then you're also asking individuals who have problems with reading and writing to fill out a form and submit it back to the Illinois Public Aid Department. So, for that



reason and more, I'm opposed to the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Mrs. Braun, you have a question?"

Braun: "No, Sir, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to just make a comment and I've kind of been talking more than I wanted to today. But, Representative, I'm going to have to oppose this Bill. It seems to me that it sets up a system that allows for arbitrary attacks on people who.. who rely on Public Aid. The Department can make the decision on who it is they want to single out for this treatment. I ask the question, 'What are they going to report on?' You know, send in a post card. 'I'm still here. I'm still poor and I still need the money.' The fact of the matter is that we have already an elaborate system in Public Aid for verifying eligibility on a regular basis. That system needs to be... it needs to be used. There is no question but that it can be improved. But this legislation, what I think, set up a mechanism for attacking poor people and for.. and for adding just another burden to their lives and I respectfully encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Donovan to close."

Donovan: "Just.. I would just ask for your favorable vote on this good, cost effective Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 43 'aye's, 47 'no's. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 5.. 1566."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1566, a Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago Policemen's Retirement Fund Article of the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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



Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have three Bills, 1566, 1567, and 1570 which deals with the Chicago Retirement Systems. House Bill 1566 provides for an increment to three percent as of January 1, 1981. Presently there's only two retirement systems which provide an automatic cost of living increase at one and a half percent. All other systems are either at two or three percent. Last year, the General Assembly passed and the Governor signed House Bill 1803 and subsequently the Bill for the General Assembly increasing the post retirement benefit to three percent, those currently covered at three percent include the Chicago teachers, downstate teachers, state universities, state employees, Park District employees, Chicago Park District employees, downstate police and fire, the General Assembly and also the legislative. This is extending the same benefit to the members of the Chicago policemen's retirement fund and I would urge your support of House Bill 1566."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Terzich?"

Terzich: "Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate some votes on this Bill. As I mentioned there are three Bills requiring the post retirement benefit. Now all of the systems have this particular benefit that we supported at no additional contribution. This particular system pays the majority higher cost of any system outside the General Assembly and also the Judges' retirement system towards their pension benefit. They are at the lowest end which is at one and a half percent. All other systems in the entire state exceed that, yet they're contributions are in excess of that. And now we are faced with inflation. They have monies in their funds



and it's only applicable to the Chicago system and I would urge your support on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 73 'aye's and 26 'no's. Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "I would like a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Bullock, vote 'aye'. Mr. Leverenz votes 'no'. We'll poll the absentees. Mr. Lechowicz?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees; Abramson. Beatty. Bell. Bluthardt. . ."

Speaker Bradley: "Cullerton, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the poll of the absentees; Bowman. Campbell. Capuzi. Casey. Collins. Conti. Davis. Deuster. DiPrima. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewing. Flinn. Dwight Friedrich. Getty. Greiman. Griesheimer. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Johnson. Emil Jones. Katz..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Friedrich? Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Klosak. Kosinski. Kulas. Leinenweber. Marovitz. Mautino. McBroom. McGrew. McMaster. Meyer. Pechous. Peters..."

Speaker Bradley: "Peters, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pierce. Polk. Preston. Reed. Ryan. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Slape. Stearney. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Taylor. Totten. Tuerk. Vinson. VonBoeckman. Walsh. Wikoff. Willer. Williams. Winchester. Jake Wolf. Woodyard. And, Yourell."

Speaker Bradley: "Piel from 'no' to 'aye'. 77 'aye's. 26 'nay's. This Bill failing to.. failing to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. 1567."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1567, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill.."

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

Terzich: "Well, again, Mr. Speaker, this fixes the Chicago



Labors' Retirement System and it increases the post retirement increment from two to three percent. This system is currently funded at 87.29 percent. They haven't had any adjustment in their program since I've been in the General Assembly and all this does is bring them up to the three percent, as all of the other systems. It's at a minimal cost They're properly funded. And I would urge your support on this particular Bill, showing your consideration for the retirees and the pensioners with inflation at 18%. I would like the same courtesy extended to these people that you extended to yourself when you voted for your pension benefit."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Lechowicz, the Gentleman from Cook. "

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I took a head count. There's 92 people on this floor and I strongly recommend that we adjourn and get out of here. Or else I will have a verification on any other Bill after this series is called because these aren't going anywhere either."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 72 'aye's, 24 'no's, and this Bill, failing to get the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. You want to try 1670 (sic)?"

Terzich: "Oh, yes. I'm going to get a Roll Call on these things anyhow."

Speaker Bradley: "1670 (sic)."

Terzich: "Right. Again, this is a..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 16.. 1570? "

Terzich: "1570."

Speaker Bradley: "I'm sorry..."

Clerk O'Brien: "1570, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of



the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Terzich: "Again, this applies to the Chicago municipal employees who are at 50% funded. Put on your same Roll Call. We know where you stand on it."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, I'll tell you one thing, that I do take pride in the job that I've done in the pension area; for the last nine years and I've stood up for what was right under the pension system. And it's sort of despicable to see that the system that hasn't had any adjustments over the last nine or ten years because of political problems. They couldn't even come to the General Assembly and ask that their benefits be adjusted to meet their needs even if they wanted to pay the cost for it themselves and for us to continuously, you know, support other systems that have it and ignore these poor people. I will certainly take that into consideration when I see faces before me in the future."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 74 'aye's, 20 'no's. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 282. Mr. Borchers, for what purpose do you arise?"

Borchers: "On a personal privilege, I just would like the Chair to remind Representative Pullen that when she comes down that pass, that speed, if I am ever in the way, I'll never be able to make it out of the way."

Clerk: "Brien: House Bill 282, a Bill for an Act creating the Metro-East Depressed Area Land Use and Community Development Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones, arise?"

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move that we adopt the proper



rule if we're going to adjourn so that Bills that have been on the list or that were supposed to die today would be carried over until Monday."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bill 282, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mrs. Younge?"

Younge: "Yes, very quickly, this Bill revises the original Bill that was vetoed creating the Metro-East Depressed Areas Land Use Authority and would create a public developer that would help develop in the metro-east area and I move for the approval of this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Ralph, vote me 'aye', would you please? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 57 'aye's, 33 'nay's. The Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Let's read the adjournment Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, and the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives; to wit; Senate Joint Resolution #97, resolved by the Senate of the Eighty-First General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, April 25, 1980, it stands adjourned until Monday, April 28th, 1980 at 12 o'clock noon. When the House of Representatives adjourns on Friday, April 25, 1980 it stands adjourned until Tuesday, April 29, 1980 at 12 o'clock noon."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright. Mr. Lechowicz moves the adoption of the adjournment Resolution. All in favor signify



by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it.

Now, House Bill 2272."

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

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

Lechowicz: "Before we get into them, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to suspend the posting rules for House Bill 1839 and 3369 to be heard in the Insurance Committee on Tuesday, April 29th at 4:00 p.m. I believe this matter has been discussed with the Minority Leader."

Speaker Bradley: "What's the numbers?"

Lechowicz: "1839 and 3369. Mike, I guess."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave on those two postings? Hearing no objection..."

Lechowicz: "1839 and 3369."

Speaker Bradley: "While, he's checking we've got Representative Breslin to table a Bill. Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to table House Bill 2826 please."

Speaker Bradley: "2826?"

Breslin: "Please."

Speaker Bradley: "You the Sponsor of this?"

Breslin: "I am, Sir."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady have leave to table? Hearing no objection, the Bill is tabled. Now we have some requests for a vote change we'd like to..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Balanoff requests to vote 'aye' on Amendment 17 to House Bill 2955."

Speaker Bradley: "Is there leave? Hearing no objection..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Sumner..."

Speaker Bradley: "There is leave."

Clerk O'Brien: "Requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 2710."

Speaker Bradley: "Leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Swamstrom requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1239."

Speaker Bradley: "Leave? Hearing no objections, leave."



Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Kent requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 447."

Speaker Bradley: "Leave? Leave."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Sumner and Laurino request to vote .. Sumner vote 'no', Laurino vote 'aye' on House Bill 2222."

Speaker Bradley: "Leave. Hearing no objections, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Stanley requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 842. And Representative Hudson requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 1952 and 'no' on House Bill 971."

Speaker Bradley: "Is there leave? Hearing no objection..."

Clerk O'Brien: "...2. Representative Sandquist requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 971."

Speaker Bradley: "Any objection? Hearing none, it is so moved."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Domico requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 1387."

Speaker Bradley: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave."

Clerk O'Brien: "And Representative Swanstrom requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 447."

Speaker Bradley: "Any objections? Hearing none, it is so recorded. Alright. Now... While we're waiting for the Minority Leader, Mr, Kane on 2272."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's a very simple Bill. All it does is say that multiple daily Sessions will be counted only for a two year period. It takes care of a problem and I would urge the adoption of House Bill 2272."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2272, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Any discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish?"



Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 57 'aye's, no 'no's, and this Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Now, back to Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz; "I'd like to renew my motion, Mr. Speaker, to suspend the posting rules on House Bills 1839 and 3369."

Speaker Bradley: "Hearing no objections, the posting rule will be waived and they will be heard in.."

Lechowicz: "Insurance Committee. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Insurance Committee, now. Mrs. Catania has a motion on waving that particular rule also."

Catania: "Yes, I'd like to waive the posting rule so that Senate Bill 1378 can be posted for a hearing in the Human Resources Committee on Wednesday. It was inadvertently omitted when the staff..."

Speaker Bradley: "Senate Bill?"

Catania: "1378. I've checked with both the Chair of the Committee and the Minority Spokesperson and they have no objections. Was posted this week and was not heard so they'd just like to carry it over to next week."

Speaker Bradley: "Just one minute. Hearing no objections, the rule will be suspended and it will be posted for hearing next week. Now, on page 16, Constitutional Amendments, #43 on Second Reading. Mr. Vinson? Mr. Vinson on.. You move... "

Vinson: "Yes, I would move to withdraw Amendment #3 which I filed to table it. Throw it away. And I would request that you do that with Amendment 4 and 5."

Speaker Bradley: "I so move. Then there's no Amendments on it?"

Vinson: "That's correct."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright. Then we can move the.. Oh. Oh. There's a number five. Amendment #5, who's the Sponsor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Peters.."



Speaker Bradley: Peters? Table... He tables that Bill (sic).

Alright, there are no Amendments on it, then we can move it to Third Reading. Did we read it a.. Mr. O'Brien?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Bill has been ... "

Speaker Bradley: "Okay. Now, there are no Amendments on it, so we can... It's been read a second time. Third Reading And HJRCA 47."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #47, this Resolution has been read a second time previously."

Speaker Bradley: "Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments..."

Speaker Bradley: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. Any further business? Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 731, Redmond-Madigan-Giorgi, et. al., honoring Stanley L. Johnson."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this... House Resolution 731 will honor Stanley L. Johnson, who will honored in Bloomington the night of his retirement from the Presidency of the State of Illinois Naperville, CIO. And if any Member of the General Assembly would like to be included, just drop down below and tell the Clerk. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolution."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolution. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. Mr. Lechowicz, on the adjournment."

Lechowicz: "Move the House stand adjourned till April the 29th 12:00 noon."

Speaker Bradley: "The motion..."

Lechowicz: "Perfunctory..."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The



House stands adjourned."



LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
APRIL 25, 1980

PAGE

HB-0282	3RD READING	PAGE	136
HB-0331	3RD READING	PAGE	116
HB-0660	3RD READING	PAGE	79
HB-0821	3RD READING	PAGE	16
	3RD READING	PAGE	64
HB-0842	3RD READING	PAGE	20
HB-0958	3RD READING	PAGE	90
HB-0971	3RD READING	PAGE	31
HB-1030	3RD READING	PAGE	68
HB-1136	3RD READING	PAGE	50
HB-1404	3RD READING	PAGE	99
HB-1566	3RD READING	PAGE	132
HB-1570	3RD READING	PAGE	135
HB-1741	2ND READING	PAGE	7
	MOTIONS	PAGE	14
HB-1823	3RD READING	PAGE	129
HB-1952	3RD READING	PAGE	18
HB-2028	3RD READING	PAGE	104
HB-2104	3RD READING	PAGE	32
HB-2165	3RD READING	PAGE	74
HB-2222	3RD READING	PAGE	56
HB-2272	3RD READING	PAGE	139
HB-2656	2ND READING	PAGE	4
HB-2710	3RD READING	PAGE	119
HB-2826	MOTIONS	PAGE	138
HB-2856	2ND READING	PAGE	5
HB-2955	2ND READING	PAGE	82
HB-3073	2ND READING	PAGE	6
HB-3080	2ND READING	PAGE	6
HB-3201	2ND READING	PAGE	7
HB-3609	1ST READING	PAGE	68
HB-3610	1ST READING	PAGE	68
SB-1484	1ST READING	PAGE	7
SB-1646	1ST READING	PAGE	7
HR-0726	3RD READING	PAGE	3
HR-0730	3RD READING	PAGE	66
HR-0731	3RD READING	PAGE	141
*HJR-0012	MOTIONS	PAGE	8
*HJR-0043	2ND READING	PAGE	112
	2ND READING	PAGE	140
*HJR-0046	2ND READING	PAGE	112
SJR-0097	3RD READING	PAGE	137

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
 APRIL 25, 1980

PAGE

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REVEREND KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	14
HOUSE RECESSES	PAGE	66
SPEAKER - BRADLEY - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	68
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	137
MEMBER VOTE CHANGES	PAGE	138
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	141
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	142