

Speaker Redmond: "House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Be led 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. It is written in the eighth verse of the Seventh Psalm; 'The Lord shall judge the people. Judge me, oh Lord, according to my righteousness and according to my integrity that is in me. ' Let us pray. Oh Lord, God, our Heavenly Father, Thou who knowest all our needs and all our capabilities. We give our joyful praise to Thee this day as we begin our duties of service in this House of Representatives. Lead us above all temptation of partisan politics and personal pride as we strive to accomplish a better and more stable government for the State of Illinois and its people whom we do serve under the watchful eye of <sup>thy</sup> everlasting judgment.'. Through Jesus, Christ, our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: Pledge of allegiance."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Your switch only. Take the record. Senate Bills, First Reading." Representative Ryan, do you have a motion? Where is the real Representative Ryan? "

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1457, Preston, a Bill for an Act to exempt drugs and medical supplies and certain foods for human consumption from occupation and use taxes. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1625, no.. I'm sorry. 1626, Abramson, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Industrial Commission. First Reading of the Bill.



Senate Bill 1631, Mahar, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense for the emergency services and disaster agency. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1636, Woodyard, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Conservation. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1637, McBroom, a Bill for an Act to provide for appropriations for certain agencies. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1640, Ewing, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1643, Kornowicz, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1662, Peters, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Rehabilitation Services. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1665, Telcser, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Capital Development Board. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1666, Telcser, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Capital Development Bond Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1771, Dawson, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1773, Dawson, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Workers Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1810, Dave Jones, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Retailer's Occupation Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1812, Matijevich, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1946, Bradley, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1957, Stuffle, a Bill for an Act relating to



taxes on farmland. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1991, Telcser, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1992, Telcser, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1993, Telcser, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1994, Telcser, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Property Fire Loss Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1995, Telcser, a Bill for an Act concerning investigation of fraud on insurance companies. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2000, Peters, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to state finance. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1618, Schuneman, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Personnel. First Reading of the Bill. "

Speaker Redmond: "Requests for vote changes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Hannig requests to vote 'aye' on a motion to recommit on House Bill 1525. Does he have leave? Representative Hannig requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2731. Representative Hannig requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2731. Is there objections? Representative Donovan requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2731. Are there objections? Representative Hannig requests to vote 'aye' .. Representative Hannig and Huskey requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2762. Are there objections? Representative Ewing requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 2762. Are there objections? Representative Hannig and Ralph Dunn request to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2841. Are there objections? Representative Johnson requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2845. Are there objections? Representative Kucharski requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill



2898. Are there objections? Representative Hannig and Piel request to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2918. Are there objections? Representative Hannig requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2932. Are there objections? Representative Hannig and Greiman... Representative Hannig requests to vote 'aye', Representative Greiman requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 2960. Are there objections? Representative Hannig requests to vote 'aye' and Representative Piel requests to vote 'present' on House Bill 2985. Are there objections? Representative Hannig requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3007. Are there objections?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf? J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "I was just wondering how come we have the same people asking to be voting? Were they here that day or what?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know. I think the inquiry should be directed to them."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Harris requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3154. Are there objections? Representative Karpel requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3173. Are there objections? Representative Hannig requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3195. Are there objections? Representative Hannig requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3196. Are there objections? Representative Hallstrom requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3198. Are there objections? Representative Barnes and C.M. Stiehl request to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3204. Are there objections? Representative Hudson requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 3206, Are there objections? Representative Hannig, Kelly, and Ropp request to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3211. Is there objections? Representative Hallstrom requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3271. Is there objections? Representative Ropp requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3291. Are there objections? Representative Johnson requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3365 and



3366. Are there objections? Representative Reed requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 3470. Are there objections? Representative Reed requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 3471. Are there objections? Representative Breslin requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3470. Is there objection? Representative Virginia Frederick, Harris and Winchester request to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3595. Are there objections? Hearing none, it shall be journalized." Senate Bills, First Reading.

Senate Bill 1483, Murphy, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1578, McGrew, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1893, Darrow, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. "

Speaker Redmond: "... Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 800, Johnson, 801 Johnson, 802, Johnson, 803 Yourell and 804, Karpziel."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Johnson's Resolution of 800 honors the Reverend Carol T. Mooney, 25th anniversary of ordination. 801 notes the new dean of the University of Illinois College of Law. 802 recognizes outstanding service, Illinois Commerce Commission. 803 by Yourell heralds the 50th wedding anniversary and Karpziel's 804 talks about the opening of a new hospital. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to reiterate some of those that .. or perhaps ask for those over in the office so... Resolution 800 for the Reverend Mooney is not the infamous Reverend Mooney is it Sir?"

Unknown: "Harold T."



McGrew: "Yes, thank you."

Unknown: "I don't know if he is."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion on Representative Giorgi's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions? Those in favor of the motion say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. Resolutions are adopted. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. I know that we all realize we have to have the press and the free press, but there's a sentence in a column written by Mike Royko, and I'll just read it and I think it's a disgrace to the press and to everything connected with it. He says, 'Well I don't know if the ERA people are slipping cash to any Legislators, but I certainly hope they are.' Now, to me, that's the bottom of the barrel, the very press that criticizes everything that goes on around here and then to suggest that he hopes that the ERA people are slipping money to Legislators. That's a new low as far as I'm concerned and I hope he gets censored by his own paper. I predict he won't. Why don't you censure him John? You don't believe in that either."

Speaker Redmond: "On the Order of the Speaker's Table; appears House Resolution 279. Representative Pechous. Out of the record. You want it tabled or do you want... What did you say? Okay. How about House Joint Resolution 2? So you want that one out. How about Senate Joint Resolution 42? Representative Birchler? You want to move to adopt that?" Out of the record. House Joint Resolution 90, DiPrima? Out of the record. 91, we don't have a Senate.. a House Sponsor, is that correct? Representative Birchler?"

Birchler: "Why don't you.. I'll just table that Resolution . It won't be..."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to table House



Joint Resolution 42? Hearing no objection, leave is granted? Do we have a Sponsor for Senate Joint Resolution 91? Representative Pechous? "

Pechous: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to table HR 279."

Speaker Redmond: "279, where is it?"

Pechous: "Speaker's Table, page 12."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave to table HR 279? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Which one... That takes 89 votes. Just taking those that require simple Majority Roll Call for attendance. This in one on which you get paid. Request for vote changes, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Telcser requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2768. Are there objections? Representative Sumner requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2762. Are there objections? Hearing none..."

Speaker Redmond: "Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On the Order of the Speaker's Table, page 11. House Joint Resolution 92. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Joint Resolution 92 was the work of the Personnel and Pension Committee. Had to do with a Bill that I had before the Committee to make some revisions in the Personnel Code. Many of those things that we talked about in the Bill came about because the Personnel Code, which was first enacted in 1955 has not had many major changes. And the Bill was a little too complex so we decided to form a Joint Committee of the House and Senate to take a look at some of the things that have changed over the intervening 25 years to make recommendations to the General Assembly for changes in the Personnel Code. Committee recommended it be adopted and I would move for its adoption."

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



McCourt: "Would the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

McCourt: "Could... Would the Sponsor please tell me in his mind what is the difference between a Committee and a Commission?"

Totten: "Well, Mr. McCourt, there's a lot of difference. We have an existing structure of the House and Senate that has Members on Committees that study substantive measures that come before the House. A Commission is a new creation that may or may not have Members of Committees who would deal with the substantive legislation, who may also have public members, who may also have other members on it. Commission usually cost the General Assembly additional money because of other Members being on it. This would be done through the existing Committee structure and outside of maybe per diem for Members who would be on these subcommittee, would not cost any additional money."

McCourt: "What... What Committee structure is that going to be done in?"

Totten: "Personnel and Pension."

McCourt: "Well, then if the Personnel and Pension Committee can do this, why do we need this Resolution?"

Totten: "To direct the Commission... the Committee to do it."

McCourt: "This is just another layer of bureaucracy it seems to me. I'm just flabbergasted that this Gentleman who is so much against adding to government red tape and this and that... always wants to eliminate Commissions, would come before this Body and want another layer of government to investigate something that could be investigated without this Resolution. "

Speaker Redmond: "You ready for the question? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that House Joint Resolution 92 be adopted. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"





Representative Barnes."

<sup>J</sup>  
Barnes: "Verify the Roll Call."

<sup>^</sup>  
Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 69 'aye' and 18 'no' and the motion fails. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Inquiry, Mr. Speaker. This I find on our desks. How was this distributed?"

Speaker Redmond: "It was not distributed by me or with my permission."

Collins: "Well, with or without your permission, Mr. Speaker, it's against the rules."

Speaker Redmond: "I know that. Permission was denied by the Speaker's Office."

Collins: "Permission was denied and it was done anyway."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it found its way out there."

Collins: "Can I ask you who asked you for permission?"

Speaker Redmond: "You can ask me but I won't tell you."

Collins: "But you won't answer?"

Speaker Redmond: "No."

Collins: "I'm not surprised at that either."

Speaker Redmond: "I'm not a stoolie. Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "The Body would like to congratulate you on your being a Majority of one."

Speaker Redmond: "What did you say? Yes. In due course.

Priority of Call, Third Reading. House Bill 3288. Out of the record. 3861, Representative Schraeder. Schraeder, 3861? Will you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk? "

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill .."

Speaker Redmond: "2861."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 3377. Elementary and Secondary Education Committee, is that Schneider? Representative Mulcahey."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3377, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "I don't know.. I don't imagine we'll get back to this today, will we, Mr. Speaker, if..."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

Mulcahey: "I don't imagine we will get back to this today, so we might as well go with it. House Bill 3377 is a Elementary and Secondary Education Committee Bill. It concerns itself with teacher dismissal and reasons for dismissal. Would simply allow that a first year non-tenure teacher may be, if by request, that teacher should ask for a hearing concerning the reasons for his dismissal, his or her dismissal, may be allowed a hearing to determine exactly what the reasons were for that dismissal. <sup>Currently</sup>..... As it stands right now, of course, second year nontenure teachers do have.. are entitled to this particular right and this simply will also allow first year nontenure teachers the same hearing. And I would ask for your Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative.. Who is that? Oh, Casey. His hair used to be black."

Casey: "That's right, Mr. Speaker and when I came down here for this brief sojourn, I asked you if you had any recommendations for me and you said just be quiet and listen to all the brilliant speeches. And I'd even up the other statements I'd made in prior Sessions. I didn't intend to speak on this Bill and I don't think I would except that some young Lady from the Illinois Education Association contacted me and asked me to support it. And, I asked her who she was and somebody told me she was the hot dog girl. Well, I don't know what that means, but this certainly is a hot dog of a Bill, I'll tell you. Actually this Bill is really the start of instant tenure for teachers. This is a terrible Bill. It says that these probationary teachers that are supposed to come for a year and you take a look-see at them,



and if they don't get along with the other teachers, if they can't teach reading and writing, which probably some of the new ones can't, why then you have to put in writing why you're going to dismiss them. Now, in checking around with the School Boards, I find that if you want to come and talk to them, they'll tell you why they don't want you and why they're going to terminate your probationary status and that's within their jurisdiction. And this is just an erosion of the School Board's rights. Now, I wouldn't imagine why one of them would want to really know and have it in writing except for this and this is what I think is the fault of the Bill. It is the start of instant tenure for the people, for the teachers, probationary teachers. If they step in the door and anytime you're starting this due process system, it can end up in court. And that's the real reason to put it in writing and even as a lawyer, I wouldn't want to start off putting these things in court. So, you're starting the due process system, putting things in writing, lawyers get ahold of it and say they're not entitled to be dismissed and therefore, it's really a step in saying they have instant tenure. I think it's a terrible Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. During my eight years in the House, I served on Education Committee for six years and I'm sure that anybody who had served on those Committees, that Committee with me knows that I've been anything but an advocate of the concept of teachers unions, the IFT or the IEA. I think they rather considered me their nemesis on that Committee and were partly responsible for my removal this term. But for anyone to suggest that this is a creation of a teacher tenure Bill is merely an indication that they don't know what the realities of what the School District's are doing in



this state to young school teachers. I would point out particularly in Lake County, not in my particular District, or Representative Friedrich or Matijevich's District, but in the 32nd District several School Districts are forthwith firing school teachers in April, not giving them any idea what they're being fired for, letting them go, casting them adrift, placing them in a position where it's difficult to find new employment because they've been fired without reason, the inference being that they have some particular problem. I looked into a couple of the complaints of this sort from the western part of the county and I find out that in fact, many of these teachers have not a thing wrong with them. They're working for totally incompetent school administrators who are in fear of their own jobs by keeping competent young teachers around. Now, we're not in any way destroying or creating any type of monster with the tenure system by merely requiring the School Districts to stand up and give a reason for letting the teacher go. If, in fact, the School District has lost money or lost students, which in turn causes them to lose money from the state, and they can't afford a teacher, they can tell the teacher that. They can simply say, 'Look it. We don't have the money to keep you on and we're cutting back.' If a teacher has a problem and some teachers might well have a problem, disciplinary, a teaching problems, so maybe they don't fit into the type of approach the School Board wants, they have an obligation, to the School Board Members, just like any employer does to tell these .. the particular employee why they're going to be let go, why they're going to be fired or laid off. I think this is just a Bill that calls for a plain and ordinary fairness and I believe it deserves the support of this House. It may be another one of those arrows in the quiver of the School Teachers



Association, but I don't oppose the concept of associations. I believe that they're providing a service to the teachers and in this case the teachers deserve this, especially the young, the new teachers who are new to teaching. They deserve to know why they're going to be laid off, fired, or told that they don't want to be back in the school system. I urge a very strong 'yes' vote on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Getty: "Representative Mulcahey, do I understand as the Bill is amended, it requires only two things, <sup>and then</sup> that a reason for dismissal be given and then that there be a review by the School Board only if there is a request within ten days? "

Mulcahey: "That's absolutely correct."

Getty: "And there is no standard set forth that would require this review to be anything other than merely a simple review by the School Board?"

Mulcahey: "That's correct."

Getty: "Tell me why? It doesn't approach a hearing. It doesn't approach anything that we are mandating the School Board to do except to simply review it. Is that correct?"

Mulcahey: "That's absolutely correct."

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think as this Bill has been amended, it's a very fair and laudable Bill and I'm going to support <sup>it</sup> as amended."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Anderson: "If there is a RIF, reduction in force, they cannot get a review on this. Isn't that correct?"

Mulcahey: "Yes, that's correct."

Anderson: "And this is, like Representative Getty pointed out,



this is not a full blown hearing, this is just a simple review."

Mulcahey: "That's correct, yes."

Anderson: "Okay, I think I'd like to speak for this too. Because, like Representative Griesheimer, I have friends who have been dismissed, for no reason at all, and they've been jacked around to a position, especially after their first year that they don't know whether they're employed; they're not employed or just where they are. And, to start out in the field of education after at least sixteen, seventeen years of education and putting all this time in, and then to have a job and then to be dismissed without even someone giving you a cause for your dismissal, I think is just ludicrous. I support your Bill, Representative."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, throughout the last two weeks, this Bill come out of Committee, there have been arguments made against it that have absolutely nothing to do with what's in the Bill as amended since the Amendment was placed on the Bill in the Elementary and Secondary Committee by Representative Steczo and myself. One argument has been that somehow this Bill creates a hearing situation for the nontenured teacher. There's no hearing required as you've heard here today, absolutely none. The Bill has nothing to do with those situations where there's a reduction in force or elimination of a particular type of teaching service or program. Secondly, an argument's been made during those two weeks that somehow this confers some sort of legal standing. That's absolutely untrue. A third argument's been that why the situation with certain types of causal dismissal that there has to be remediation, giving the teacher who's dismissed some cause, some reasons and giving them a chance to do right, if you will. That's absolutely



untrue as well. The Bill is nothing more than what Representatives Anderson, Getty, Griesheimer and Mulcahey have said. It certainly isn't instant tenure. That's a ridiculous argument and I think even the people who promoted it know it. This Bill should be passed for the reasons cited here today."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After serving 26 years in administration, 16 years as a classroom teacher, I've had an opportunity to talk to a lot of beginning teachers, older teachers and School Boards. My mail coming from School Boards, and administrators say they oppose this Bill. Caused me to make personal telephone calls to several of those persons that have written the letter. I said, 'What is it about this Bill that seems to be giving you trouble?' They said, 'Well, we were told by the lobbyists for our organizations to write and tell you to be opposed to this Bill.' I said, 'Are you having any problems with this Bill and with the contents of this Bill?' And I didn't have one, single administrator tell me that he would have problems with this at all. The Bill, as amended, is a good Bill. It's a necessary Bill and I ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: " Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to make two or three observations on this Bill, both as a classroom teacher and Chairman of a small department and as a Member of the organization that is behind this particular program. Let me talk a little bit about the genesis of this problem which really can be found in the higher education level where it takes a much longer time to get on tenure, usually six to seven years and you're placed on tenure. The normal approach of educators of course is a helping kind of approach. In other words, we're trying to improve



the opportunities by improving the skills and the talents of those people with whom we work, both our students as well as our colleagues. And so the natural tendency of school administrators has been, since many of them have come out of the classroom, in fact, most of them have, is to give advice and counsel to those people who work for them. This same thing was true on the college level until a particular legal concept began to develop and that is that a person has a property right to a job. And if that is true, if a person has a property right to a job, then you dismiss the person and give them reasons for dismissal, the burden of proof falls upon you as the dismitter to justify that particular reason for dismissal."

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

Piel: "My apologies to the speaker, Mr. Speaker, but would the doorkeeper, for every time I've noticed in the last year that we have an IEA Bill on this floor here, right inside the door the IEA lobbyist stands. Would the Doorkeeper please remove them and from now on when the IEA Bills come up, keep them off the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "All unauthorized persons leave the chamber. Proceed, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much. I was speaking about the concept of property right which relates to a job. In higher education this is exactly what happened. And lawyers have counseled School Boards when people are dismissed, to dismiss them and to not give them reason for that very reason, the very reason that they will be taken into court and administrative time and legal time and money will be eaten up in this particular situation. I find this very unfortunate, that this has happened. I, for one, have always wanted and have in the past always have told people who have left my department at my suggestion,





what they might do to .. to improve themselves as far as I was concerned and perhaps it would help them in some future job. But the fact of the matter is, that the law and the concepts are in the law. And school administrators all the way down to people working at the level I am, as the Department Chairman, are unable to do many of the things that we would like to do because we have been circumscribed by the law. This will place that first year teacher right in that position of requesting a review, getting the review, getting the reasons, and then walking right into the courtroom and say, 'Prove that this is the reason you dismissed me.' Now, the comment that was made earlier by the Representative from Lake County in terms of young teachers being dismissed and many times hired back is done because School Boards have to protect themselves with that 60 day notice. That 60 day notice has caused more trauma for young school teachers than anything else. If you want to deal with that issue, you have to deal with the 60 day notice issue which is in the law now. And it's for that reason, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that I have to rise to oppose this Bill because you're only going to eat up money and time and talent that could better be spent on school teachers and students."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members, now that you've heard from the administrative teacher, who sees teachers in his usual paternalistic approach is taking them by the hand and even getting psychologically involved because he describes his role as trauma, I think you ought to hear from the classroom teacher. What I think the administrators and Boards want to pretend to think, that they hold all the answers to



what constitutes effective teaching. I would say to you this Bill doesn't touch on any of the things that were referred to by the previous speaker. It's just a continuing carry over of his attitude as he sees the teachers in the role. So, one of the problems I think with that assumption is that the assumption is wrong. I think teachers ought to be part of the classes. But that's not anything to do with this legislation. What I think we ought to understand is that this will not confer instant tenure, but rather, it confers continuing accountability. And I think the Boards ought to welcome it. Teachers, when they are confronted with the shortcomings of their teaching and when the Board and the administrators address themselves to those shortcomings, a teacher will respond or they will understand that they are going to go out on their ear. And I've taught now since 1962 and I have found that happening day in and day out. The only concern a teacher has, whether he or she is a first year teacher or a tenure teacher, is tell me what I'm doing wrong, I will correct it. If I cannot correct it, then there's a philosophical difference between me and the School Board, then, of course, I can't remedy it. I expect to leave. This doesn't do anything that is described by some of the critics. Certainly it doesn't erode the power of the Board. I think it strengthens their hands. It certainly is not instant tenure. This is a very important, I think, approach to improving teaching. A lot of you have got to look at it from the role of the teacher who really wants to be an effective and good teacher. And I think this confers the kind of authority on the Board that they need to enhance that good education and that good teaching that's.. so often the Board will say is for the benefit of the boys and girls of Illinois. And so I think



this is a supportive Bill... an easy Bill to support  
and I would ask that you also vote 'aye' on the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birkinbine."

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

Speaker Redmond : "He will."

Birkinbine: "Amendment 1 said that the teacher has a  
right to request a written review within ten days. Is  
that right?"

Mulcahey: "That's correct."

Birkinbine: "What is meant ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order."

Birkinbine: "What is meant by 'review'?"

Mulcahey: "Well, it's exactly what it says. I haven't  
got Webster's definition of the word 'review', but  
it is simply a process by which that teacher comes  
before the Board of Education at that request and  
asked for a review of the reasons as to why they are  
being dismissed. Many.. Many organizations have this  
as you very well know, in other fields of employment.  
And it's a very fair request."One of things you've got  
to keep in mind, too, is that teachers are a lot dif-  
ferent than a lot of other people in <sup>other</sup> professions. They  
have permanent records and they have credentials that  
are sent on to other schools when applying for other  
jobs. These records go in there. And if a teacher indeed  
wants to ... wants this review made available...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster, calls to my atten-  
tion the fact that we don't have very good order. Please,  
please. It's ten o'clock and midnight is fast ap-  
proaching. Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Well, my concern with that was that if there's  
no firm definition or really a rough idea anywhere in  
writing about what constitutes a review, that in itself  
could become a hassel and we'd bring you more trouble



on it. Another question, do we have laws on the books now that say that.. say, if I were to go to work for a company or a gas station or MacDonald's restaurant, or you name it, and after the first year I got canned, that is there' statutes on the books that say I can request a written review and demand a hearing by my superior?"

Mulcahey: "Well, in some cases, this is true, yes."

Birkinbine: "On the statutes, or is that collective bargaining agreements which call... Say I wasn't a unionized person, say I was in a white collar job, say I had a masters degree in business administration..."

Mulcahey: "It's not in the statute."

Birkinbine: "So we're doing something for teachers that we're not doing for other white collar workers, many of whom might also have masters degrees?"

Mulcahey: "Well, of course, they can.. Somebody can go to bat for them , if they want to I imagine, yes."

Birkinbine: "Excuse me?"

Mulcahey: "I imagine somebody could go to bat for them, if they wanted to. I'm going to bat for the teachers right now."

Birkinbine: "I see. So we're conferring special rights and privileges on the teachers, but we're not for other people in society." "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. Representative Mulcahey to close."

Mulcahey: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. It was very well discussed and debated here and I think everybody knows and realizes that nontenure teachers, second year teachers, the provisions for them



are already on the books right now. This simply allows for review for first year nontenure teachers. It's to have a reason given to them for their dismissal. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call. I also might point out too at this point that the same request goes for me that somebody made over there a few minutes ago. I think it's also true that the Chamber of Commerce lobbyists, the Illinois Manufacturer's lobbyists, and everybody else, they can probably get their tails off the floor when we're discussing their Bills as well."

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

Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Deuster, one minute to explain his vote."

Deuster : "In one minute I'm going to indicate that this is so serious in my mind, another step toward binding up our schools in red tape, that I'm going to request a verification. I hope everyone will vote their own switch. Our schools ought to be teaching children. If you're wondering why we've had Senate Bill 101 and we have a strong push to help the parochial and the private schools, it's because our public schools are a disaster and we have a lot of incompetent, miserable teachers locked in. Now this may sound like good theory, all this red tape and due process and going to court. But, in practice it doesn't work out. Because, in practice what happens is the administrators somehow miss the ten days or they miss the procedural requirement and here you have a monopoly situation, the public schools with some pretty miserable teachers locked in there. That's why when fifth grade comes along, they may go over to Santa Maria, or some private school. If you want more of the same, if you want to continue in the direction that's destroying the public schools, vote 'yes'. But I think this is a bad concept. We've had too much of this. We ought to get rid of tenure rather



than expanding it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Hallstrom, one minute to explain her vote."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was originally against this Bill for many of the reasons that everyone has discussed. After..

Speaker Redmond: "Doorkeeper, please, please, a guest in the gallery; please be seated. Please. Escort her... Clear the gallery. Escort her out of the chamber. Doorkeeper, escort her out of the chamber. No, out of the chamber. Out of the chamber, Doorkeeper. Out of the chamber. We don't tolerate anybody disturbing the decorum of the House. The Chair admonishes the Members, et tu, Brutus. Representative Hallstrom, please...."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider, Hoffman, the IEA meeting is in the rotunda. Come on. Campbell, Hudson, Ryan, please sit down. Representative Hanahan, you're wanted outside the door on the fourth floor. Representative Hallstrom. Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope my few words did not bring on that confusion. But I thought I'd wait until everyone was quieted down. As I was saying, I was originally against this piece of legislation because I am against mandating the School Board, taking away anymore control from the School Board, etc. When this Amendment was put on, I voted for the Bill in Committee. I think it's a fair Bill. I feel that there's been many things brought up today on the floor that really are not pertinent to this. I do not see it as complicated as everyone is trying to make it. It merely says that when a young teacher is fired, it's a courtesy just to let that person know why they're fired. There is no more .. no automatic hearing, and if the person does not request a simple review in ten days, that's all there is



to it. So I think we should vote 'yes' on this Bill."  
Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is akin to a one date marriage. You date him once and you've got to be married. The same thing you're doing to the School Board now and it's nice for us to say there are more teachers than administrators and therefore, we ought to vote with the teachers. But I think what you're saying is, let's look at the school system. It is the inability to rid yourself of teachers who might be bad teachers, an inability to do anything in terms of control, and what you're now doing is opening the door even further to say that there's no possibility because as a lawyer, I tell you, as soon as you write out the reasons, you're going to have court suits, challenges, and administration will find that it's easier to go along and serve out their time, rather than try to fight the Board for teachers that might have the interest of the children at heart. I think it's a mistake along the way and as the Bill exists I can only vote 'present'."

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

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't see why we need school administrators anymore. I think we should go throughout the state and eliminate all school administrators and let us start administering all the schools from right here in the General Assembly. Now, we're taking teachers that are probationary periods and putting them and locking them in, in most cases with very little recourse of the school administrator. Now, there's no sense of us having school administrators anymore. Let's just legislate all the school administration from right here in Springfield and do away with the school administration."



Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 98 'aye' and 48 'no'. Representative Deuster requests a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Mulcahey desires a poll of the absentees. In proper order, from your seat. That's what the rules say. Rules say. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees; Abramson. Bluthardt. Braun. Conti. Davis. Dawson. Ralph Dunn...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis?..."

Clerk Leone: "Ebbesen..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute now. Davis, 'no'. Representative Kent?" "Kent."

Kent: "Could I have a point of personal privilege, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Kent: "In the gallery, on the Republican side, is the sixth grade students of Madison School. This is the grade school where I graduated and they are represented by Mike McClain and Gale Schisler and myself. Welcome."

Speaker Redmond: "Point of personal privilege is well taken. Please, please proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the absentees; Ebbesen. Farley. Grossi..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grossi."

Grossi: "Mr. Speaker, please record me as 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Grossi, 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Kane. Klosak. Laurino. McBroom. Meyer. Molloy. Robbins. Sandquist. Schlickman. Skinner..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner, 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Telcser..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative J.J. Wolf desires leave to be verified. Representative Deuster? Permission for Wolf to be verified? Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Telcser..."

Speaker Redmond: "Lechowicz desires leave to be verified. Pro-





ceed."

Clerk Leone: "Watson. White. Willer. Winchester. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Now the verification of the Affirmative  
Roll Call. Christensen?"

Christensen: "May I be verified?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Christensen desires leave  
to be verified. Verify the Affirmative."

Clerk Leone: "Alexander. Anderson. Balanoff. Bell.  
Bianco. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Breslin. Brummer.  
Bullock. Burnidge. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman.  
Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Daniels. Darrow.  
DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Epton.  
..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn desires to be verified,  
Mr. Deuster. Okay. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich.  
Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman.  
Griesheimer. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hanahan. Hannig.  
Harris. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Johnson. Dave Jones.  
Emil Jones. Karpel. Kelly. Kornowicz, Kosinski.  
Krska. Kucharski. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Madigan.  
Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McAuliffe. McClain.  
McGrew. McPike. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. Oblinger.  
O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Polk. Pouncey. Preston.  
Rea. Reilly. Richmond. Ronan. Ropp. Satterthwaite.  
Schneider. Sharp. Skinner. Slape. Stanley. Steczko.  
E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich.  
Van Duynes. Vinson. VonBoeckman. Williamson. J.J. Wolf.  
Sam Wolf. Younge. And, Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser, 'aye'. Any questions  
of the Affirmative Roll Call? Representative Stearney,  
'aye'. Kane, 'aye'. Willer has requested to be recorded  
as 'aye'. Conti, 'no'. Now, what's the count? Repre-  
sentative Watson, 'no'. Frederick, Mrs. Frederick, 'no'.  
102 'aye' and 52 'no', Mr. Deuster. Any questions of



the Affirmative Roll Call?"

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, if I do ask the names of some Members that are here I want to apologize because the call went a little fast and the Members are all around. Alexander?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Slape desires to be verified. Representative Ronan, how do you desire?"

Deuster: "Verified 'no' were they?"

Speaker Redmond: "Ronan and Slape desire to be verified. Now, what questions do you have of the Affirmative?"

Deuster: "Mrs. Alexander."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Mrs. Alexander in here place? Is she asleep there? How's she recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove her."

Deuster: "Mrs... Oh, I see Mrs. Balanoff. She's here. Woody Bowman. Oh, there he is. Mr. Bradley." "Mr. Bradley. Gerald Bradley."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley is here."

Deuster: "Mrs. Breslin?"

Speaker Redmond: "She's here."

Deuster: "Oh, there she is. Mr. Brummer?"

Speaker Redmond: "Brummer? Brummer? How is he.. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Mr. Capparelli."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Deuster: "Mrs. Currie."

Speaker Redmond: "Brummer has returned. Mrs. Currie is in her seat."

Deuster: "Mr. Doyle?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's always here."

Deuster: "Mr. Epton, oh, he's back in his seat. Mr. Griesheimer."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Deuster: "Oh, there. Mr. Hallock."



Speaker Redmond: "Hallock here? How is he re... He's back there in back of Gene Hoffman."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Hannig?"

Deuster: "There he is. Mr. Henry."

Speaker Redmond: "Henry?"

Deuster: "Henry.?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. Henry, he's back there."

Deuster: "Mr. Kelly."

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

Deuster: "Where were we, with Mr. Kelly?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, Kelly."

Deuster: "Is he here?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, I... Didn't we remove Kelly? Take him off. He's not here."

Deuster: "Mr. Kornowicz."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. "Mr."

Deuster: "Mr. Kucharski."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn, 'aye'. Representative Kucharski is in his seat."

Deuster: "Mr. Marovitz."

Speaker Redmond: "Marovitz here? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Mr. O'Brien."

Speaker Redmond: "O'Brien here? How's.. You mean the Clerk? How ... Is Representative O'Brien in his seat? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Mr. Patrick."

Speaker Redmond: "Patrick here? He's here."

Deuster: "Mr. Pechous."

Speaker Redmond: "Pechous is here."

Deuster: "Mr. Polk's in his seat. Mr. Pouncey?"



Speaker Redmond: "Taylor Pouncey's back there."

Deuster: "Mr. Rea."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Mr. Richmond. Oh, I ..."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Deuster: "Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Speaker Redmond: "She's here."

Deuster: "Mr. Sharp."

Speaker Redmond: "Sharp's here."

Deuster: "Mr. Skinner."

Speaker Redmond: "Skinner, he's right in the middle aisle."

Deuster: "Right in the limelight. Mr. Slape."

Speaker Redmond: "Slape? We verified him. Slape and Ronan."

Deuster: "Mr. VonBoeckman?"

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Sam Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Wolf, Sam Wolf? He's back there."

Deuster: "No further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count? 97 'aye', 52 'no', and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3160, Garmisa. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3160, a Bill for an Act in relation to issuance of bonds and notes by the Regional Transportation Authority to establish and operate a working cash fund. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3160 authorizes the Regional Transportation Authority to create and operate a working cash fund. The Bill also amends the RTA Act to enhance the sale-



ability of bonds and notes that are issued by the RTA. RTA cash flow problems reached their peak in January of 1980 when the agency found itself with a cash shortfall of 60 to 65 millions of dollars. This particular crisis was solved when the 73 million dollar federal subsidy check that was due in October arrived on January 23rd of 1980, approximately four months late. In addition to untimely federal receipts and other problems the RTA has, addresses itself to the creation of the working cash would be the time lag that exists between the RTA regional sales tax collections and the actual receipt of these funds by the authority. And this sometimes lag a period of over three months. The resulting RTA cash flow problems caused the authority to make late payments to transit carriers and other vendors they do business with. And as we all know, late payments cost more than timely payments because of the interest charged. This Bill, as it's been amended, authorizes the sale of a hundred million dollars in working cash fund bonds or notes to derive something to operate the working cash fund. The term of these bonds is limited to a period of ten years or less. The dollars from the working cash fund can be used to pay RTA operations, including the payment of funds owed to transportation carriers holding purchase of service agreements with the RTA. This working cash fund will insure timely payment to those agencies who rely on the RTA for a substantial portion of their operating funds. This Bill provides a sensible approach to handling cash flow problems which many times are out of the hands of the RTA. The operation of working cash fund would allow timely payments to transportation carriers who will in turn will be able to meet their obligations in an efficient manner. This Bill is extremely important to the smooth operation of public transportation in northeastern Illinois and I ask for your favor-



able consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In House Amendment #5, Representative Garmisa, it says that you're allowed to as you alluded to, sell bonds to the limitation of ten years. But it says there that they are . . . You said that you would sell one hundred thousand dollars worth of bonds, if I remember correctly. But the Amendment states that it would sell four hundred million dollars worth of bonds. And as I remember your testimony the other day, you said that this money would come out of current revenue. So, in other words, I take that to mean, by the Digest and by what you said the other day, that the current revenues would be used to pay off this four hundred million dollars in bonds and that the discretion as to where the money was going to come from would be solely upon the RTA Director? Is that correct?"

Garmisa: "The current revenues would be used to pay all bonds."

Van Duyne: "Yes. Well, what have you got against, instead of shortchanging the current revenue, which are very short by your own allegations, why do you have such a horrendous, whatever the word is, against raising your fares? Where really the only ones that are real, you know, are in real trouble here is the CTA in the first place and everyone knows that. And I think that rather than shortchanging Will County or McHenry County or Kane County in terms of the existing revenues to pay off these four hundred million dollars worth of bonds, you should really see the handwriting on the wall, raise the fares where they are needed and that's in the CTA area."

Garmisa: "Representative Van Duyne, it's not really the shortage of funds we're concerned with, but it's the lag in the getting of these funds, the time differential, between receiving these sales tax receipts and between . . . and the time . . . the differential between getting the



federal funding. This is what this Bill addresses itself to."

Van Duyne: "Yeah, well I understand that. That's just a difference in terminology."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish everybody would look closely at this Bill. For the life of me I can't understand why anyone would vote to let the RTA expand their bonded indebtedness by another hundred million dollars. This tax eater is already projecting a huge deficit in the coming year. It probably cannot meet the obligations that they already have. Yesterday they reneged on a deal that they offered to this Assembly a year ago in abolishing the half fare funds support from the state. Now, they're taking that back. Now they want another hundred million dollars of indebtedness to pile on top of already a staggering load. They'll be back here next year asking for more money. You can bet on that. They'll be asking for additional tax revenues, sales tax revenues, gas tax revenues. There is no end to this. This voracious monster that was created over the prostrate bodies of five counties and suburban Cook County, this continues to gnaw away at the resources of the State of Illinois. Let's for once say 'no', no to this monster. This Bill is ridiculous as the whole concept of RTA is ridiculous. Let's turn it down. Let's start rolling it back and let's ultimately abolish this thing."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Garmisa to close."

Garmisa: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the last speaker was making reference to an additional hundred million dollars in bonding indebtedness. This does not ask for any additional funding. The bond



authority, authorization still remains at the five hundred million that they have. There is no increase in that. And I can't understand why the misunderstanding keeps popping up. But, with respect to House Bill 3160, we'd be talking about enhancing the saleability of the RTA debt. The RTA's authority to refinance a debt of transportation agency under jurisdiction is made especially clear. The Bill allows the RTA to use bond proceeds to establish and subsequently increase the debt service reserve fund. And the authority is given to the RTA Board to appoint a corporate trustee to receive revenues that are generated by the RTA regional sales tax, instead of these funds being transmitted directly to the RTA. And this trustee would keep funds necessary to make debt service payments and turn the remaining balance over to the authority. This Bill is a good Bill and it's sorely needed to keep our operations of the RTA and our transit in the northeast section of this state working as a smooth operation. It is sorely needed. And I ask for your favorable support."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill troubles me deeply because it deviates so greatly from the advice that Paul Simon used to give when he was in the General Assembly. He suggested that we shouldn't continually borrow money to finance current services, but instead should pay them out of current taxes. This Bill will do just the reverse of that. We'll be using future revenues to pay for current expenses and it seems to me that the RTA's adamant refusal to consider raising fares for commuters and mass transit riders when our car drivers have seen a 50% increase in the cost of gasoline over any 12 month period in the last 18 months, is not a fair trade-





off."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, if this should get 89 votes, I would request a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell. Ewell?"

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I must rise to ask some questions of the neanderthahl minds on the other side of the aisle that are completely blocked anything that the RTA attempts to do. Now, I've seen some people who have no light shining in, but here we have a classic case, if the RTA is mentioned, these neanderthahl minds that must be bolted in steel and encased in concrete rise up and oppose it. They never look at the merits of the Bill, what it attempts to do, but simply if it has the label on it, RTA, they all go out and parade for the benefit of their reelection. At one point of the line, you've got to stand for something, Gentlemen. At least read the Bills and find out what the problem is. It's a cash flow problem with the RTA. They're not asking for any additional revenue. They're trying simply to put their own business in order and your failure to help, your concrete minds, your inflexibility, I ask you to read the Bills for a change and not jump up simply because it's RTA. It's a good Bill, if you only take the time to read and it deserves your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 88 'aye' and 62 'no'. Representative Garmisa requests a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees; Balanoff. Bluthardt. Braun. Conti. Darrow..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow is 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "John Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Gaines. Klosak. Laurino. Marovitz. McBroom..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne, for what purpose



do you arise?"

Van Duyne: "I'm just pointing at your vote over there, Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What's that?" "I didn't hear you."

Van Duyne: "You're forcing me to say this publically, Mr.

Speaker. I'm just astonished at your vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the poll of the absentees;..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Please record me as 'aye', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative

Flinn desires to be recorded as 'aye' and to be verified.

Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the poll of the absentees; Meyer.

Molloy. Mulcahey..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Neff..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Peters. Robbins. Sandquist. Satterthwaite.

Schisler. Schlickman. White. Wikoff. J.J. Wolf.

No further."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Mr. Speaker, may I be verified please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallstrom desires to be

verified. How many... 91 'aye' and 63 'no'. Represent-

ative Willer?"

Willer: "Yes..."

Speaker Redmond: "Willer?"

Willer: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change my 'yes' vote to

'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "90 'aye' and 63 'no'. It's 90 'aye' and

63 'no'. A request for a verification. Who requested

it? Why not let Walsh do it? We'll have something

in his record. You see the book he's got back there.

We want to put something in <sup>that</sup> <sup>page</sup> at first base. Verification

of the Affirmative Roll Call, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Alexander. Beatty. Bianco.



Birchler. Bradley...."

Speaker Redmond: "Balanoff. Wait a minute. Balanoff 'aye'.  
Krska, do you seek recognition? Oh, Balanoff. Proceed  
now."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bradley. Brummer. Bullock. Burnidge.  
Capparelli. Capuzi. Catania. Chapman. Cullerton.  
Currie. Daniels. Darrow. Davis. Dawson. DiPrima.  
Domico. Doyle. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Flinn.  
Virginia Frederick. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi.  
Goodwin. Greiman. Hallstrom. Hannig. Harris. Henry.  
Hoffman. Huff. Jaffe. Dave Jones. Emil Jones.  
Karpel. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski.  
Krska. Kucharski. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz.  
Macdonald. Madigan. Margalus. Mautino. McClain.  
McGrew. McPike. Neff. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous.  
Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Reed. Richmond.  
Ronan. Ryan. Schneider. Sharp. Stearney. Steczo.  
C.M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich."

Speaker Redmond: "No whistling on the floor."

Clerk O'Brien: "Vitek. VonBoeckman. Williamson. Winchester.  
Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call?  
Representative E.G. Steele, 'aye'. Now, who requested  
the verification? Representative Collins. Any  
questions?"

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Alexander."

Speaker Redmond: "Alexander in her chair? How is she  
recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove her."

Collins: "Bianco."

Speaker Redmond: "Bianco in his seat? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Collins: "Capparelli."



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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Collins: "Dawson. "

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Collins: "Farley."

Speaker Redmond: "Farley? Farley in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Representative Meyer, for what purpose do you arise? Record Representative Meyer as 'aye'. Representative Capparelli has returned to the chamber. Put him back on the Roll Call. "

Collins: "Greiman."

Speaker Redmond: "Greiman? How is he recorded? Somebody point to Greiman over there? Greiman. How is Greiman recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Representative McCourt, for what purpose do you arise? McCourt, 'aye'. Representative Polk? 'Aye'. Marovitz, 'aye'. "

Collins: "Hannig.."

Speaker Redmond: "Who? "

Collins: "Hannig."

Speaker Redmond: <sup>Is</sup> "Hannig in the chamber? He's way in the back there."

Collins: "Henry."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Collins: "Henry."

Speaker Redmond: "Henry back there? He's there, yeah."

Collins: "Huff."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff? Is Huff there? How is he recorded?"



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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Representative Greiman has returned. Put him back on."

Collins: "Kornowicz."

Speaker Redmond: "Kornowicz here?"

Collins: "Oh, I see him."

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

Collins: "McGrew."

Speaker Redmond: "McGrew? He's here, Representative Conti? Conti, 'aye'."

Collins: "O'Brien."

Speaker Redmond: "O'Brien, is he here? Remove him."

Collins: "Stearney."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Collins: "Telcser."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Collins: "Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Wyvetter Younge, is she here? How is she recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove her."

Collins: "No further questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative J.J. Wolf is 'aye'. Representative Wyvetter Younge has returned. Put her back on the Roll Call. Schisler, for what purpose do you arise?"

Schisler: "I don't know if you need me yet."

Speaker Redmond: "Expunge the record. Representative Telcser, 'aye'. Oh, he's back. Pardon me. Well, that's the same thing. Representative Taylor. Huff is back. Put him back on the Roll Call. 92 'aye', 61 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.



3430. Representative Ewing? "

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3430, a Bill for an Act in relation to the personal property tax replacement fund.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask leave of the House to have this Bill placed in Interim study, House Revenue Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 3513. "

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3513, ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

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

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, with great sorrow and a heavy heart, I would.. I would ask to have this Bill placed in Interim study on the House Revenue Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Leave is granted.

3488, Representative Garmisa. The plan... Call your attention to the fact that we have scheduled to go until 3:00. It's the plan to go through the Priority of Call, then to go to the Order of Consideration Postponed and take those Bills on the order of priority, the order in which they came on the Calendar. And on that basis, 2131 will be the first one. You can figure it out for yourself. Representative Schnedier."

Schneider: "You mean every Bill on Priority first? Including appropriations Bills?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, we'll leave appropriations... everything on the Priority here first and then Consideration Postponed. "



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3488, a Bill for an Act relating to tort immunity, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3488 as amended would provide board members of the Chicago Transit Authority with similar immunity from prosecution for damages arising out of determination of policy or exercise the discretion that is afforded to all other local public officials. This immunity is not granted when willful or wanton misconduct can be proven. The Bill also provides for indemnification of board members for other acts performed in the course of their duty except for willful and wanton misconduct. The CTA is allowed to purchase insurance to cover the indemnification provision that I have just described. This is a simple Bill which seems...that would provide... that seeks to provide the same immunities for CTA board members that other local officials currently enjoy. I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill was amended by an Amendment that Representative Garmisa, Collins, and myself sponsored, so we really have no problem with the Bill now. The only thing I would like to know is if the Sponsor would commit that this is the...still will not be amended in the Senate by putting back the things that were amended out. Is that...do we have that assurance, Representative Garmisa?"

Garmisa: "You...I...you have my assurance. That will not be done."

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? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 13...42 'aye', and four 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."



3490. Representative Garmisa."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3490, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Regional Transportation Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 3490 would amend the RTA Act to require monthly pro-rata payments to all grant and service contract recipients, whenever sufficient funds are not available for the full payment to each recipient. Presently the RTA has discretion over the amount of monthly payments made to each carrier and this Bill states that within 15 days after the adoption of the RTA budget, the Board is to determine what percentage of the total amount of funds to be paid to all carriers is to be received by each of those carriers. Whenever these funds are available, or they're insufficient to pay each carrier in full, each carrier would receive the percentage of funds as is stated in the budget. And this method would assure an equitable distribution for all parties that are involved. I would ask for your favorable consideration of this good piece of legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Leinenweber: "You say currently the RTA has discretion to make whatever pro-ration or partial payment for the purchase of service agreements that it wishes. Is that correct?"

Garmisa: "That is correct."

Leinenweber: "And they wish... The Bill seeks to deny them that flexibility. Is that correct?"

Garmisa: "That is right."

Leinenweber: "And, specifically the main beneficiary would be the CTA, I would assume. Is that correct?"





Garmisa: "This... The beneficiaries would be all carriers, All carriers involved would get that percentage of the receipts that are due them."

Leinenweber: "What has the practice been that led the ...this Bill to be introduced? Was it because that they were giving more money to some of the commuter railroads than the CTA, or what?"

Garmisa: "The main reason for this Bill, Representative Leinenweber, is the inconsistency that is now involved in the present method of payment and we want to overcome that inconsistency."

Leinenweber: "Well, what has the practice been? What was the inconsistency that led the CTA to request this legislation?"

Garmisa: "The Board would make a determination as to just what funds would be paid to each carrier . As we have it now, there's \$100.00 available for distribution or if there's \$100.00 owed and only \$90.00 are available, the .. each carrier would get 9/10ths of whatever would be due them. This is an equitable way to handle all carriers."

Leinenweber: "What effect would this have if any.. on the requirement on the RTA Act that the money raised in the specific county be spent there?"

Garmisa: "It has no effect at all on that."

Leinenweber: "Okay. Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think this is another Bill we probably ought to look at. The RTA was created to run an efficient, supposedly an efficient, transportation system in the six county region. Apparently the practice has been that when cash flow problems arise, that the commuter rails have been given.. been paid money which the Bill would require go to the CTA. I think we ought to think about this. There's been a lot of complaints from the, particularly suburban Cook County area, that have been shortchanged in



money being spent for transportation services outside of the city of Chicago. I think this would probably exacerbate that problem rather than correct it. One of the... For example, the Rock Island Railroad, which is currently being run by Chicago Northwestern. Chicago Northwestern is telling the RTA where they can go. And, there's.. this may exacerbate that problem if the private rails do not have to perform the services are not paid. I think weought to think about this Bill carefully:"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Inquiry of the Chair. Are there any Amendments on this Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "According to the Cälander, there are none. Page six of the regular Calendar."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Garmisa, to close."

Garmisa: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what this Bill addresses itself to is really a fair and an equitable distribution of the cash that would be available to the RTA to pay off their carriers and their debts. And it, rather than a haphazard distribution of funding as has been done in the past, I think that this Bill would really provide for a fair distribution of the available cash. I would ask for your favorable support."

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 Vinson."

Vinson: "If we get to 89 on this I'd like a verification, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question



there's 82 'aye' and 59 'no'. Representative Garmisa requests a poll of the absentees. Representative Richmond desires to be recorded as 'aye', Richmond. Mulcahey?"

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of announcement. In the Speaker's gallery behind .. in front of us up here we have Joe 'Smithleheimer' from the Illinois Department of Law Enforcement. Want to stand up to say hello?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative... Representative Matijevich.

    Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees; Bluthardt. Braun.

    Breslin. Christensen. Donovan. John Dunn. Ralph Dunn.

    Ebbesen. Hallstrom. Dave Jones. Karpziel. Klosak.

    Laurino. McBroom..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reed, 'aye'. Representative

    Karpziel, 'aye'. Will you please break the caucus up?

    I know that Representative Pullen has brownies today,

    but... Representative Pullen, 'aye'?"

Pullen: "'Aye', please."

Speaker Redmond: "'Aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the poll of the absentees;

    McBroom..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne, 'no'. John

    Dunn, 'aye'. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "McBroom. Meyer. Molloy. Robbins.

    Sandquist. Schlickman. C.M. Stiehl. Telcser.

    Watson. White. Wikoff. Winchester. And J.J. Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giddy Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Dyer recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady's recorded as voting 'no'."

Dyer: "Please change that to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change it to 'aye'. Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "I'd like to be recorded as 'aye' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald, 'aye'. Campbell,



'aye'. 90 'ayes' and 58 'nos'. Are there any questions? Representative Vinson has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Balanoff. Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Brummer. Bullock. Burnidge. Campbell. Capparelli. Capuzi. Catania. Chapman. Cullerton. Currie. Daniels. Davis. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. John Dunn. Dyer. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Hoffman. Huff. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Karpel. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Macdonald. Madigan. Margalus. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McCourt. McGrew. McPike. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Peters. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Pullen. Rea. Reed. Richmond. Ronan. Schisler. Schraeder. Sharp. Slape. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Vitek. VonBoeckman. Williamson. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions?"

Vinson: "Representative Younge, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "She's here."

Vinson: "Representative Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Vinson: "Representative Wolf, Sam Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sam Wolf back there? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Taylor."

Speaker Redmond: "Taylor's right down here. Representative Keane desires leave to be verified. "

Vinson: "You did remove Representative Sam Wolf, didn't you?"



Speaker Redmond: "I have."

Vinson: "Representative Steczo."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Schisler."

Speaker Redmond: "Schisler? He's back there."

Vinson: "Representative Krska."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Vinson: "Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Redmond: "Jaffe, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Daniels."

Speaker Redmond: "Daniels, is he here?"

Vinson: "Where?"

Speaker Redmond: "He was here a minute ago. Over here."

Vinson: "Representative Hoffman."

Speaker Redmond: "Hoffman, is back in his seat."

Vinson: "Representative Karpiel."

Speaker Redmond: "Karpiel back there? Yes."

Vinson: "Representative Burnidge."

Speaker Redmond: "Burnidge is back there."

Vinson: "Representative Davis."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Vinson: "Where?"

Speaker Redmond: "With Van Duyne." The big fellow with his  
wings coat off."

Vinson: "Oh.."

Speaker Redmond: "The paper in his hand."

Vinson: "Representative Dawson."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him." Representative Hallstrom?

Representative Hallstrom desires to be recorded as 'aye'."



Vinson: "Representative Bianco."

Speaker Redmond: "Bianco, is he here? I see him back there. Representative Bianco? He's here."

Vinson: "Representative Giorgi."

Speaker Redmond: "He's around someplace. Right in the middle aisle."

Vinson: "Would you have him move so I can see across to the other seats?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's Lechowicz you can't see around."

Vinson: "Representative Kosinski."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. Always here."

Vinson: "Where is he?"

Speaker Redmond: "Roman? In his chair, where the rules say he's supposed to be."

Vinson: "No further questions."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know yet."

Vinson: "Representative Lechowicz seems to know."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, the Clerk... Maybe the Clerk told him. He didn't tell me yet."

Vinson: "Well, you're the real Speaker, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "You bet I am. On this question... Representative Lechowicz?? No. Darrow."

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

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

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Darrow: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Donovan. Representative Donovan, 'aye'. Now, what's the count, Mr. Clerk? 57 'no', 89 'aye'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 697."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 697, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the



Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "697, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I took this Bill out of the record yesterday in the hopes that Representative Ebbesen who is an opponent of the Bill might have an opportunity to speak against it as I know he would and others will. It is a Bill of some controversy, since the pension impact is stated quite large. Let me first start out by explaining the Bill. That if you're reading the Digest on 697, you will see in the opening paragraph of the Digest, or the Synopsis, that the Bill relates to the State Police Retirement fund. Look at Amendment #1 which has basically become the Bill. The Bill now has absolutely nothing to do with the State Police Retirement fund. The Bill simply amends now the state employees retirement fund which is the main retirement fund for state employees in the state, the largest fund. The Bill was introduced in an attempt to secure some stability and security officers for correctional people in our state's correction system. The turnover in corrections as opposed to the balance of state employment is considerably higher due to the danger and the unhealthy, in many cases, working conditions behind the walls of our state correctional institution. It was hoped and this came out of a House Prison Study Committee that was created two years ago of which I was the Minority Spokesman, it was hoped that other than salary considerations which have been addressed I feel not as great as they should, but that pension considerations also should be taken into account. The Bill was introduced with the idea that if we could beef up the pension consideration for correctional employees who tend to have a 30 to 35 percent turnover in state employment, that we could lure them into staying in the system and becoming stable,



correctional, institutional officers and workers and that we could avoid the retraining and the tremendous cost of retraining particularly security personnel in a very high ...attrition...rate. Stateville penitentiary in my district, in Joliet, has a one hundred percent attrition rate or had up until last year. The recession is taking some positive effect on that and thank God for that. But that means that every year, 700 new correctional officers are hired in Stateville. Joliet Correctional, another major facility, has a similar problem. And so does the McDonough <sup>Youth</sup> center and one and on and on. Pontiac experiences the same thing. ~~Wherever~~ the conditions are worse, the turnover is greatest. So, if you flush all that in and think in terms of a 30 to 35 percent turnover in corrections as opposed to a 15 to 16 percent turnover in the general state employment, you can see that the problem needs to be addressed. House Bill 697 would address that by simply raising the contribution effort of the Department of Corrections employees and for employees covered by Social Security it would be raised from four percent to five and a half percent. For employees not covered by Social Security from eight percent to nine and a half percent. And the pension increases then at the end... or at retirement at the age of 60 would then be considerably or consequently not considerably, consequently higher. When the Bill is amended went to the actuary for the pension impact note it came back and I'll tell you this, the unfunded accrued liability in the impact note says 20 million dollars. We feel that they took a rather unrealistic view of that particular impact note simply because they did not address the high...attrition... factor in the Department of Corrections. We have tried to minimize the impact on this Bill by allowing the pension increase only after you've served a minimum of 20 years. Currently you can





retire with only eight years service if you are.. if you're 60 years old in state employment, but you could not receive the higher benefit under 697 unless you had served 20 years with the Department of Corrections. We did go further in Amendment #3 on the House floor the other day and take in all people working in the Department of Corrections who have daily contact with inmates. That Amendment was made at the request of the people who work behind the walls themselves because they felt in a hostage situation, in a dangerous situation that the guy working in the kitchen along with residents had just as much danger as the guards walking on the tier. It is a major pension Bill. It is a major increase. I hope I can answer any questions that you might have and I would ask Representative Birchler or Stuffle to close or maybe both."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative... Any discussion? Representative Polk?"

Polk: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Polk: "I noticed that this.. this reflects upon Chapter 108 and paragraph one and two and I wonder if you would tell how that really affects that particular Chapter 14-dash through 143?"

Davis: "What is your understanding of those Chapters?"

Polk: "Well, I was concerned because of the longevity factor in there and the period that.. how that reflected on 27 and 28 that we amended two years ago. And I just wanted to know if you felt that had really a major impact and something we should be concerned with."

Davis: "No. The acceptance of the positive would be a negative factor."

Polk: "Well, will that wash out then over a period of seven years?"

Davis: "No, it's nine,nine years."



Polk: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler. Representative  
 B. B. Ralph Dunn, pardon me."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I couldn't so much  
 noise in here I couldn't hear the answer of the Sponsor  
 on Representative Polk's Bill where he said that  
 affirmative and <sup>the</sup> negative. I didn't quite get that.  
 Representative Davis, do.... I didn't understand your  
 answer to his question about how that.. that last..."

Davis: "Well, frankly, Representative Polk and I neither  
 one understood the question."

Dunn: "Mr. Chairman, I think maybe I'd like to address the  
 Bill. I think maybe..... This is an important Bill to  
 people in the penitentiary and people that work as  
 guards in the penitentiary . In our districts and in  
 districts throughout the state, where, as Representative  
 Davis said, there's a lot of turn over in prison  
 guards. I certainly admire anyone that has the courage  
 and the fortitude and patience to serve as a guard in  
 one of our penal institutions and I think that they  
 should be not second class citizens and they shouldn't  
 be treated as such. They should be allowed to have  
 a <sup>respectable</sup> pension system and be able to retire as members  
 of the State Police do and perhaps even members of the  
 General Assembly. I think that we should give them an  
 'aye' vote on this Bill. I appreciate your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I surely want to add my  
 voice to Representative Davis' and Representative Dunn's.  
 I have been to Stateville penitentiary many, many times  
 in the past five years and this is all you ever hear  
 from the guards up there, the danger that's involved in  
 that job and the turnover and the lack of cooperation  
 and.. and oh, I don't know, the durability of the job.  
 It seems that there are more gang members working in there



than there are real professional guards and I.. I don't know if this is the answer to the concept, but I know it's going to cost the state some money. But nevertheless if you're going to have any kind of a penal institution where you have some stability, and some professionalism in the guards and the people of the administration that run these, I think this is a very good step and I would encourage everybody on this side to support the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield for a couple of questions? Representative Davis, you mentioned that this was for security guards. You also mentioned that it's for the cooks. Did you.. Does this also include parole officers?"

Davis: "It includes everybody that has daily contact with inmates, including parole officers. There are approximately 6,000 people involved in the Bill."

Terzich: "That also includes secretaries and what have you."

Davis: "Anybody working behind the wall."

Terzich: "Was this Bill approved by the Pension Laws Commission?"

Davis: "It was not."

Terzich: "Was it approved by the Pension Committee?"

Davis: "It was... Well, it was discharged from the Committee.

It had seven votes, but it was discharged from the Committee, Representative Terzich, as you know, in your absence unfortunately."

Terzich: "Yes, so it was discharged. Well, unfortunately this Bill, although it's commendable about the security guards, goes beyond just covering security guards, but covers all employees of the Department of Corrections. At the present time, they receive the same benefits as all other state employees which I'm sure have a need for increased pension benefits. The Pension Laws Commission did not approve the Bill. There's a deficit of



over three million dollars, three million, eight hundred thousand dollars annual deficiency in the contribution, which amounts to in excess of six hundred dollars per year for each of these employees. I don't believe that this is going to solve the security guard problem by retaining any additional security guards as turnovers, since we've already increased their salary quite substantially in the last year or so. And, the Pension Laws Commission is against it. It goes beyond just covering security guards. It covers all employees connected with the Department of Corrections and if we should do this, we should also do it for all of the other state employees and it does increase the unfunded liability in excess of 20 million dollars and I would urge a 'no' vote on House Bill 697. It did not get out of the Committee. Unfortunately, it was discharged in my absence while I was at a funeral. And, I think it should.. get the same treatment of not passing as it did in the Committee as well as on Pension Laws Commission."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all I think the Sponsor of this piece of legislation ought to be complimented for the work that he's done. He realizes the situation in the turnover of security officers in our penitentiaries. There's no one group of state employees that have a job that is in that extreme dangerous category. And if you talk to some of these prison guards, you'll find out that we have to give them some kind of extra benefits for the services they provide for us. It's a thankless job and they don't make the kind of money that you would expect them to make. And the turnover is exactly as the Sponsor says. And I think, being realistic, the Pension Laws Commission really doesn't look at the problem that we have to look at. They look at a purely arbitrary set of facts and we, in the Legislature, must



take a look at it and see whether or not that there are other concerns and it certainly is the security of the citizens of Illinois by providing a system of payment to our security officers. We have to do that. And whether we don't do it to the other ones that are state employees is incidental. We can address that problem as it comes along. But this is a special group of people who we owe our security and I think we ought to give it our overwhelming support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, if you want just a quick wrap up on what this Bill is, this is a rip off. This, this Bill will take 6,000 employees of the state, in the state employees pension system, and give them unrealistic pension benefits which will increase the unfunded liability of this system by 20 million dollars. Just to give you an example of what we're doing here, just in 1976 the unfunded liability of this particular pension system was 722 million dollars. In two years it increased 89 million dollars. This Bill will increase by another 20 million dollars. So if any Bill should be killed here and now, it's this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Will the Sponsor yield for some questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Davis, am I to understand that even the secretaries who work in a front office within a prison wall, if they had any kind of contact with prisoners during that time would also qualify for this benefit?"

Davis: "Yes, Representative Satterthwaite. That's true and that was at the decision of those particular workers. Last. Two months ago, there was a hostage... hostages were taken in Michigan State Penitentiary and involved in that were two secretaries taken as hostage."



Satterthwaite: "Would this also apply equally at 'Vienna' in a medium secu... in a minimum security facility, the same as at Stateville or the maximum security?"

Davis: "Yes."

Satterthwaite: "Facility?"

Davis: "Yes."

Satterthwaite: "Do you think that is really justified? I recently visited 'Vienna' and found that it's been three and a half years since there was any attempt for anybody to even walk off the grounds unapproved. It seems to me that there is a great deal of disparity between the risks at Stateville and at 'Vienna', for instance."

Davis: "I admit you have a point, Representative Satterthwaite. However, there is a great deal of movement among the security forces from one institution to another by transfer or whatever. There are people serving at 'Vienna' even though it doesn't have walls and even though the residents there, euphemistically named, come and go pretty much as they please. But there are murderers there who have been convicted of murder. There are armed felons, armed robbery convictions. There are people serving there with violent crimes and I am not to say at this point whether tomorrow they may not decide to take a hostage for whatever reason."

Satterthwaite: "And, it would also apply then presumedly to the community work <sup>release</sup> programs where people are close to the end of their service?"

Davis: "No, that is not true."

Satterthwaite: "Now, I don't mean where.. I don't mean in the work establishment, but in the residential portion. If there are Department of Corrections personnel in the residential facility, in those work release programs, would they come under this Bill?"

Davis: "It is my understanding they would not, with the exception of parole officers. They have to be behind or



institutionalized."

Satterthwaite: "Is not..."

Davis: "Work release..."

Satterthwaite: "Is not the Champaign work release program for instance, an institutionalized program?"

Davis: "Representative Satterthwaite, I'm sorry. I cannot answer that question. I do not believe it to be true. However, I don't know."

Satterthwaite: "Well, I respect the Sponsor's attempt at trying to work out something that will encourage people to stay in the prison guard system. However, I think that this may be too broad a brush and may have in fact neglected to make some distinction that would give really adequate kind of advantages to the people on the front line as opposed to those of lesser risks."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, unfortunately in the last couple of months or maybe the year, we've been using the words, 'reform and rip off' a little too loosely. Regardless of what's said about this Bill, the proposed plan does not even begin to approach the pension formula that's currently enjoyed by the State Police, the firefighters, the air pilots, the investigators. Instead <sup>it's</sup> just a compromise plan, which attempts to curb the cost while creating an incentive for correctional personnel to remain in what is really considered a stressful and a dangerous occupation. And if there's anybody here we should pinpoint, or anybody anyplace we should slip a <sup>spotlight</sup> is to keep these people working, is to give them some kind of incentive and let's pass this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those



in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Birchler, get ready."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 697, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Birchler?"

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Stuffle will make the closing remarks and then I'll speak to the Bill on my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I was asked to close because we were able to put together some figures on this Bill, that I think refute some of the arguments that have been made against it and I think run much in line with what's been said by Representative Conti and others here today. First of all, this is not the State Police formula in any way. Indeed, it is much less than that. It's a compromise as Representative Conti very accurately pointed out. Secondly, and most importantly, we think it's necessary to have this Bill as an incentive, as has been pointed out. Some people have argued that we're giving someone something for nothing. I would point out to you that of the 6,000 people that would be covered under the Bill in the correctional facility, five of every six employees average only four years of service at this time. And they're coordinated with Social Security. That means that under the provisions of the Amendment requiring 20 years of service for this alternate formula that those people on average would have to contribute an additional one and a half percent of their salary every week and every month and every year for 16 more years to get the limited benefit increases provided under this particular Bill. Most importantly, there is absolutely no change in the retirement age. Some people





seem to believe that we've given this hazardous duty type of employment with this Bill a break on retirement age. That is not the case. I would submit as well, as Representative Davis did, that I do not believe that in making the actuarial assumptions on the cost of this Bill, although admittedly there is a dramatic cost increase of which the employees will be paying a million and a half dollars in new money a year, that I don't think the actuary looked at the 20 year provision and I don't think he looked at the fact that we now average 30% turn over on a ten year basis as opposed to about 10 to 15 in other state employment. If you listen to Representative Birchler and Van Duyne, if you could go in their districts as I have, when I worked in the Senate and my close relationship with Representative Birchler, go to some of these places and see what's going on. You can tell that indeed the cooks and everybody else there are subject to hazardous duty. Certainly as has been pointed out, they can be taken hostage or killed or attacked just like anyone else in those prison systems. I think they make good arguments for this Bill. I think the Bill ought to be passed. We do not deny that there are great costs involved, but much of it is being met. We ask for a favorable Roll Call and lastly I would say this, this is a matter of a public policy determination, one we've made over the years that hazardous duty ought to have alternate pension formula, for an incentive to keep people on the job. We're not getting enough guards now or enough guards even though we have many good ones, or enough personnel that want to stay on the job and make it a career. I would submit we've given the air pilots this sort of pension formula. In fact, we gave them even the State Police formula. We're asking these people to pay virtually as much as the State Police for even less for hazardous duty



and for those reasons and the reasons cited by others, the need for this Bill being obvious, I would ask for an affirmative vote on House Bill 697."

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

Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Birchler to explain his vote."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to repeat what the other Gentleman said in relation to this particular Bill. I happen to live in the city of Chester where Menard Correctional Center is a part of our city. The three guards that lost their lives just a few years ago were people that worked in the kitchen area, the hostage... were taken hostage, slaughtered right in that particular area, when you speak of the danger. Also was on this House floor, and a Member of this Body whenever we bought or made arrangements to lease the correctional center here in Springfield so that they could train guards. We spend millions of dollars a year training and retraining and training and retraining, giving these guards the fundamentals of what it takes to be one and then they leave the system. That is at terrific cost to the State of Illinois. I think that this is one step in the right direction. They're not getting a special favor because they have to be the 50 year old person to get the full benefit. They have to have.. pay for it with an increase of money taken from their paychecks at one and a half extra percent. I urge you and beg that you give us enough votes to pass this Bill from this House floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel." Piel."

Piel: "Mr. Speaker, I'll make my request one more time.

Will we have the lobbyists please leave the floor?"

Speaker Redmond: "All unauthorized persons leave the floor.

If you'll identify them to the Chair, we'll see they're escorted. "



Piel: "Mr. Bruce, IEA, standing over here talking ... he just walked out the door. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you know, they're making a very passionate plea for the security guards and this Bill goes well beyond the security guards. It goes to every member of the Department of Corrections, which includes secretaries, parole officers and everyone else ...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman, for what purpose do you arise? Terzich? I don't think so. If he did, he can't. I don't recall that he did."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker, similarly they had three people speaking up on the same Bill, on closing, on the..."

Speaker Redmond: "I only vote for the rules. I'm one.. 177. Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a simple matter of equity and fairness. The Gentlemen who spoke for this measure are correct. I dare say to you if we had the Judges down here, not only would we take care of the Judges, but we would take care of their widows, their children, and in fact, the long line of posterity. This Bill is only reasonable and fair and simply because the guards and correction people don't have a strong lobby like the policemen and the firemen, there is no need to treat them so inequitably, unjust and unfair. And an 'aye' vote is surely deserved in this..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 106 'aye' and 42 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 1848. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1848, a Bill for an Act to license and regulate persons engaged in the business of conducting auctions. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I leave ask... ask leave of the House to place House Bill 1848 to.. move to Interim Study Committee, the Committee from which the Bill came."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman ask leave to return it to the Committee from whence it came. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 3118. Was that Interim Study you wanted? Yes, Interim Study. 3118."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3118, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins. Collins, P.W. Take it out of the record. 3166."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3166, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to compensation of sheriffs, coroners, county treasurers, county clerks, recorders and auditors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to take 3167 first?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to take 3167 first? Okay. Read 3167."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3167, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to compensation of sheriffs, coroner, county treasurers, county clerks, recorders and auditors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3167 was introduced at the request of the Illinois Coroners' Association. Passed the Counties and Townships Committee by 14 to nothing vote. And it proposes that the increase in minimum salaries for coroner be increased to bring the <sup>minimums</sup> into line with other county official minimums that were established in 1974. Coroner enter upon their new term of office in December of 1980. So unless this Bill passes,



they will be faced with a period of 14 years without any increase in the minimums. An Illinois Coroner is on call 24 hours a day, seven days of every week in the year. More than 60 percent of them are not even provided with a full time deputy. It has been mentioned that many of them work only part time. This is true simply because they could not exist on the salaries that they now receive. Most of them are required to provide their own cars; they're required to provide operational expenses of their offices out of their salary appropriation. We believe that this request is necessary and long overdue and will assist the coroners in their efforts to professionalize and up-grade their office. This Bill passes, it will only bring the coroner up to the minimums established seven years ago by this Body, for the other elected officials. And I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Simms: "Chuck, what would a coroner in the county the size of Winnebago or DuPage, or Lake receive as a minimum?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Simms: "Winnebago..."

Campbell: "The minimum established. The minimum for Winnebago is .. the present salary is \$16,000.."

Simms: "And then with your Bill what would it go up to?"

Campbell: "\$18,000."

Simms: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Sponsor yield please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Friedrich: "In my county we have approximately 50,000. The salary would be \$14,000. Do you think you could get a qualified man to do this job who would work full time



for \$14,000?"

Campbell: "I'm sure that the County Board could."

Friedrich: "For \$14,000 that would be a qualified coroner?"

Campbell: "Well, they certainly have the alternative to hire some medical advisor to do it on a case by case basis, if they want to."

Friedrich: "Is there anything in the present law which prevents the County Board from paying a salary in excess of what the minimum is in order to attract qualified full time people? Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Alexander, are you seeking recognition? Representative Schraeder?"

Schraeder: "I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a question? How many counties are now at the minimum?"

Campbell: "Well, this would affect about 65 percent of the counties."

Schraeder: "65. Are those basically small counties?"

Campbell: "Those are basically small counties, yes."

Schraeder: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite,"

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Campbell, what would be the effective date of this Bill if it's passed by both Houses of the Legislature before June 30th?"

Campbell: "Well, they have to receive the pay raise before they go into office, which would be sometime in December. And the Bill would become effective, I assume, upon its passage."

Satterthwaite: "Does it have immediate...."

Campbell: "To take effect... To take effect previous to their entering office."

Satterthwaite: "Would it not have to have an immediate effective date or something in the Bill in order to be effective before January 1 of next year?"



Campbell: "I don't have the Bill in front of me.."

Satterthwaite: "July 1 of next year.. of this year. It has an effective date of July 1 of this year."

Campbell: "This year."

Satterthwaite: "I see. Well, if I may speak to the Bill, then I wonder whether we are now then putting a mandate on counties that will not come under the provision of the law we passed last year indicating that the state will fund any additional mandates on local government. We are mandating that the counties pick up additional costs, right?"

Campbell: "That's correct. And this isn't something new. The Legislature has done this for years, but as of January the 1st of next year any mandated program will be paid for by the state. But we can't wait until then, because of the fact that these people run this fall and will take office previous to that time."

Satterthwaite: "But what we are doing then is putting the counties in that bind of still having to pay the mandate because the Bill becomes effective before the state will have to pick it up."

Campbell: "We're only putting those counties in a bind that are not up to the minimum now."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is...

Representative Campbell, do you want to close?"

Campbell: "I simply wish for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 121 'aye' and 21 'no'. And the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3166."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3166, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to compensation of sheriffs, coroners, county treasurers, county clerks, recorders



and auditors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3166 deals only with the three smallest categories of counties, that is, zero to 14,000 persons, 14 to 30 thousand persons, and 30 thousand to 60. It increases the minimum salaries for county officials other than coroners as follows; the present minimum in a county from zero to 14 thousand is 12 thousand. The proposed minimum would be 13,500, an increase of 1500 dollars. It also increases the category of the other two by the same amount, \$1500. And I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor... Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "When was the last time those were increased?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "1974."

Brummer: "Thank you."

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

Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 123 'aye' and 18 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3487, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3487, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to state finance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike, Parliamentarian, please come to the podium."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3487 is a house cleaning Bill requested by the Comptroller's Office. I know of no opposition to the Bill. The Comptroller is presently required to





reject agency submittals to pay for improvements to real property from the repair and maintenance line item, that is, the contractual services. Because the improvement is permanent in nature. This Bill simply allows agencies to undertake minor permanent projects, those under \$5,000, and to pay for them on the contractual services line item. This is actually been the practice in the past and it would simply allow the Comptroller to go along with the current practice. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 158 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 3555. "

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3555, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3555 is a Bill for junior college funding formula. It includes several changes of which I have put out a memorandum for Members of the House to hopefully discuss the issue on what the changes are. Basically what we are doing is trying to establish the problems that we have had in terms of junior college enrollment, and that is, we did not know what the appropriation would be because we were basing it on current enrollment and that was simply a 'guess-estimate' and we oftentimes miss that several million dollars worth of credit hours for each students. That is a substantial change. Secondly we are eliminating the... Well, actually, we're combining the adult basic education and general studies development into one



line item category and we are increasing the dollar amount for disadvantaged students. We have... This is primarily the response from the Junior College Board that has studied the matter in great detail. The big change comes about because of going back to the previous year's enrollments<sup>and</sup> I felt frankly that if we adopted the junior college formula as they recommended it, we would have a great shift of dollars in the state in one year. I foresee this as a one year change so that with the dollars, would not see such a great shift in one fiscal year. That's the sole purpose of the Bill. You have a print out of precisely how it would affect the various junior college districts and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is<sup>the</sup> most atrocious Bill that ever reached the floor of the House. I want to explain to you exactly what the Bill does. Now, you've heard the Chairman tell you about what all the technical changes are, but I want to read you the bottom line. The bottom line is that the dollar amounts are the same between the Governor's formula, but the formula that Mr. McGrew has is the same dollar amount, except they rip out 2,719,327 dollars from the city of Chicago. The city of Chicago educates the most disadvantaged kids. This is the school system that has to take all those who don't get an education in the elementary and secondary schools and do the best that they can for them. They have the hocus-pocus now that they call 'formula changes and adjustments', credit hours, different rates for different subjects. Let's talk about these subjects. The average, the average rate is \$23.53. They want to pay the city of Chicago \$5.12, \$5.12. There's another figure of 6.45 on the FY '80 rate. The city of Chicago has to take all of these students



at \$6.45 and attempt to educate them. And you're talking about basic remedial structure. You get more students. This is what the students need. But when you get into other areas, they change it and they give you as high as \$41.73 for what they call 'health', \$25.22 for 'technical', \$16.39 for 'business occupational', \$26.01 for the 'baccalaureate', but then when they get down to the remedial development and the general studies they are again taking advantage of the city of Chicago. Not only were they willing to put this formula in the last time to rip off the city of Chicago, for the benefit of the other junior colleges, but this time now they're taking away the disadvantaged money that comes to us and they're ripping this out of it. There is absolutely no need for this formula change. The last formula is weighted in favor of the other colleges. And how anyone, in good faith or good conscience knowing the problems that we have in the city of Chicago, knowing the problems that the junior colleges have, could sit up and possibly vote for this Bill. It's absolutely the worst, the most atrocious, a 2,719,000 dollar rip off of the schools in the city of Chicago. Now, if you engage in this kind of activity, and say that the city of Chicago is always fair game for anything that's going to give something more to the rest of the state, it's unreasonable, unfair and unconscionable. The city of Chicago has borne the greatest share of taxation, no matter whether you talk about the.. if it's the real estate tax, we bear the most. If it's the income tax, we bear the most. If it's the money that goes into the.. if it goes into the ag premium fund, it comes out of the Chicago area. The money comes from Chicago and an effort to rip this kind of money, deliberately out of our system is unconscionable, unfair, unethical, and I say to you, Gentlemen, you cannot do this type of thing to those kids



and look in good conscience and yet ask for everything that you ask for. Now, we're not asking for more money. We're simply saying well, let the formula stay the same. But don't take \$2,719,000 from the city of Chicago and justify it on the basis that your district might get a little more. Let's be fair like we do the elementary and secondary education formulas and say, let's see that no one is hurt in this situation. But that's not the case here. Again, Chicago is fair game and I say to you it's unreasonable, unethical and immoral. And Gentlemen, you have no right to vote for this kind of Bill simply because it might cast a little more benefits to your School Districts."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I wasn't sure if the previous speaker was for or against the Bill. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Brummer: "Yes, is the Illinois Community College Board .. or the Board of Illinois Community Colleges, or whatever it's called, in support of this Bill as amended?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew, McGrew."

McGrew: "The Junior College Board has developed their own rates that's contained in the Senate Bill. They have not taken a specific position on this."

Brummer: "They have... They are not in support of this?"

McGrew: "You can interpret that as you will."

Brummer: "Okay. I think it's important here that we not become involved in a Chicago-downstate fight. Ray Ewell indicated that we were really ripping off the city of Chicago. I think it's important and I suppose many of the Members have been contacted by the Presidents of their individual community colleges. I have been contacted by two of the three that encompass part of the 54th District. They are in opposition to this Bill."



They are .. They are opposed to this Bill. They do not want to see it passed. They have.. They are in support of the Bill which is in the Senate or has passed from the Senate into the House which contains the formula developed by the Community College Board collectively and I think we ought to vote 'no' with regard to this Bill and support their Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'd like to speak in opposition to House Bill 3555. As Spokesman on Higher Education Committee, we did pass this Bill out. Representative McGrew said he wanted a vehicle' to have on the floor so he could amend the Community College Act. In looking at what he has done, I think he's done away with, or trying to do away with the work, the funding formula <sup>that's</sup> been developed by the Community College Board before it even has a chance to take effect. It was not to take effect until this year.. He revised his formula before it's ever been even tried to be proved. He removed the incentive funding for community college program for the disadvantaged student and remedial development program and while it's true it does benefit in the revision of the money, it has the same dollar amount and it does reallocate it and while it does help some of our downstate schools, it takes away money from a disadvantaged students and from Chicago. And I think in all fairness, as Representative Brummer said, that we ought to stick with the Bill that's coming over from the Senate, Senate Bill 1576 does allocate the money according to the formula and it has some increase in it for teachers' salaries. I would urge a 'no' vote on House Bill 3555."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"



Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mautino: "Representative McGrew, since there is some concern that the Chicago city system will be losing money under this proposal, what did they receive last year under the existing formula?"

McGrew: "Last year the appropriation to the city .. Chicago City District was \$37,845,000. That would go at two million dollar increase to \$39,845,000..."

Mautino: "In other words, under your program they're still going to get more than two point three million dollars more than what they received last year. Is that right?"

McGrew: "That's basically correct, yes."

Mautino: "Well, then I submit that this piece of legislation does not eliminate funding for the city districts of Chicago. They do get an increase, as does every other area. What I suppose is happening is that they were probably promised four or five million dollars and have to live with two and a half million dollars in lieu of that. I find that not to be taking money from the City District of Chicago. They are getting an increase, as everyone else is. I think we're moving around in the correct manner, not supportive of this amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative McGrew to close."

McGrew: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To be quite honest, there have been some misstatements here. This Bill does provide changes, that's very true. It said that if we left it alone we'd.. We did without this Bill, we'd be better off. That is wholly inaccurate. The way that we establish junior college funding is to increase our



categorical amount of dollars per station. It's not based on the number of kids times x amount of dollars. What we do is to go back and try to compute the exact cost of that instructional program. And, obviously that cost has gone up so we have to pass a Bill that would provide those changes. Frankly, what we're doing is trying to phase in our going back basically two years in terms of enrollment and we must, I feel, have some sort of a phase in so that those colleges that are increasing enrollment are not overly penalized by going back to two years previous enrollment. And I feel that it's very necessary. I have not said that any school would receive fewer dollars than they did last year. That's something that.. that <sup>there's not</sup> the <sup>could be</sup> said in behalf of the Senate Bill. I feel that every School District is entitled to the increases to try to keep up with their budget. Frankly, this does it. This does not try to pick out any one school and say that you do not get any increases. As a matter of fact, the Chicago School Districts will get well over five percent increase with this amount of dollars. If the Senate appropriation is passed by the House in the same amount of dollars that it passed the Senate, there would be additional money to be granted and you would see an increase in the Chicago District even under my formula of about four point million dollars. They're still wanting four point seven, which is not unusual. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Skinner to explain his vote."

Skinner: "One could feel a little more empathetic for Chicago Representatives if the Representatives from Chicago stood up at other times and screamed and howled that they were getting ripped off. They don't stand up



at other times and scream and howl they're getting ripped off and so one must conclude that they're not getting ripped off, but in fact, they are ripping us off. Now, here's a chance for us to get ours. Every junior college in my district gets more money under this formula than it would otherwise. And Chicago does not lose money. Chicago gets an extra two million dollars. Now if Chicago wants to help the students, Chicago could cut the salaries of the Chicago .. the Chicago junior colleges teachers. Of course, that would be a little bit too far to go, I guess."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The rate Bill that is coming over from the Senate has been approved by the Junior College Board. It's the one that they want. It has been the product of a lot of input by all of the junior colleges within the state. It is something that they feel that they have arrived at through an incremental process, through a compromise process and that Bill will be.. is now in the House and will be before us in Higher Education in the coming week. Higher Education last year, the senior institutions; we mandated that they should no longer provide remediation, that that was the job of the junior colleges. The Amendment.... The Bill before us as amended destroys; the reimbursement for remediation. This is done basically to cut the Chicago remediation programs. We have increased those programs in this Bill which would directly be competitive to what we are funding in our senior institutions and I would ask that you vote 'no' on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to point out a couple of things and for those of you that are so concerned that the Junior College Board has





their own formula and the Legislature shan't tamper with it, let me point out that they developed a five member subcommittee to come up with a new formula proposals. Parts of the provision of that funding proposal were voted on by that five member Committee on a vote of five.. I'm sorry, three to two, far from unanimous. To be quite honest, this group operates fairly well isolated the same as the Illinois Office of Education is isolated from your individual School Districts. You will find that most Superintendents say that yes, we should vote for the changes that they came up with. Well, frankly I submit to you that most Junior College Presidents while they are very knowledgeable in running their institution, do not know how the formula is devised and how the Legislature does it. I just think that that bears saying that it is not all that agreed upon even among that group. And I thank you for your time."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think this is a Bill whose time has come. If I have any quarrel with it, I'd say it doesn't go far enough. I've been advocating for some time that we ought to go back to flat grants for elementary and secondary education. This is a step in the direction. I don't know if we're.. the division for the particular divisions in the course of the study are accurate or not. But it's time to go back to a flat grant. If you've got so many students in school so many hours, they .. you should get so much state money and leave it up to the local community to match the rest. I think we ought to get away from this other formula in elementary education too where it's based on assessed valuation and so on. I think this is a good Bill and should pass."



Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 70 'aye' and 81 'no'. The Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. 3594, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3594, a Bill for an Act in relation to small businesses. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Slape."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3594... Thank you, Sir. House Bill 3594 is a comprehensive attempt to give aid to small businesses in the State of Illinois. The Bill is divided into three parts. Part #1 is an attempt to raise the status of small business at the state level by creating a small business division within the department. Part #2 of the Bill authorizes counties and municipalities to establish local economic development commission to provide that the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs administer a state matching grant program to provide operating expenses. And part #3 establishes a small business development centers at universities and colleges throughout the state by providing such centers with financing for an executive director. I would ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Hallock."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Slape: "Yes, Sir."

Hallock: "Representative Slape, are you acquainted with Chapter 63 on the Fiscal Note Act?"

Slape: "Yes, I am."

Hallock: "Are you aware that that says that a fiscal note is required in certain cases when we pass laws in our General Assembly?"

Slape: "Fiscal note has been filed.. filed on this Bill, Sir."

Hallock: "Do you believe that we should comply with the



statutes as they're written in our state with regard to the Fiscal Note Act?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Point of order. I think that question is totally improper to ask somebody if they are... if we feel we ought to comply with the law..."

Speaker Redmond: "Point is well taken. There's a way that you can appeal the validity of the fiscal note. Evidently that hasn't been taken. Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "The statute clearly provides that when a fiscal note has been required, is sought by one Member, that the Sponsor of the Bill must obtain a fiscal note and it must be prepared by the agency concerned. My point is this; a fiscal note has been required and requested. It should have been prepared by the proper agency, which in this case, obviously is the Department of Commerce. No such note has been prepared. My point is that without such a note, we shouldn't have proceeded beyond Second Reading. And therefore, obviously we can't go beyond our step here today, without a proper fiscal note. In order to be in compliance with the statutes of our state, which of course, I'm sure all Members of this House strongly support...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of order; Why are we talking about a fiscal note? That should have been taken care of on Second Reading, debated at that time. This Bill is on Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, the point of order was raised and I sustained the point of order. I can't control the contents of debate. Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Mr. Speaker, you as empowered officer of this House under Rule 4 have a duty to insure that the rules of this House have been complied with. If we are not meeting the needs of the Fiscal Note Act, we are there-



fore not complying with the rules of this House or the state statutes. And you, as a Constitutional Officer of this Body, I would think would feel the obligation and the duty to insure that we meet that need. And I would ask you for your support in this effort, that we cannot proceed with this Bill unless we have prepared by the Department of Commerce a proper fiscal note, which in this case, we don't have."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Chair. When was the.. If you could inquire of the Clerk, when was the fiscal note requested?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich. We'll get to your answer when... Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would concur with the concerns of Representative Hallock. In addressing the legislation as it now stands before the House, this Bill..."

Slape: "Mr. Speaker, don't we have a point of order on the floor and you're going to go back? Then we can address the Bill, can't we, Sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I'm recognizing Representative Simms. I don't know what purpose he rises for."

Simms: "To speak on the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Slape: "Oh."

Simms: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill has been greatly expanded by the adoption of an Amendment. What this Bill does now, it requires the establishment of a ten member small business advisory Commission. Now the members will serve with the appointment of the government.. Governor with no compensation staggered two year terms. It's a duplicative thing already that is being accomplished by the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Secondly, it requires that 'DECA', the small division...



the small business division to establish a series of small business assistance centers at public universities. It requires appropriations to these centers, to require personnel to work with the small businesses. It provides no guidelines whatsoever as to how many of these centers are needed. In addition to the expensiveness of this Bill and how ludicrous this Bill has become, there's no appropriation to accompany this Bill and it's not in the budget of the Department. And the Department is opposed to this. What we're doing, once again, is expanding government. We're expanding the cost of government. We're establishing another level of bureaucracy. We are establishing more jobs in the area of the bureaucracy. We are creating some more bureaucrats to be in the state universities and around the state on the public payroll. Irrespective of who the Governor of Illinois is, or who should be in the position of W. posture of appointing this Commission, and also in hiring the necessary personnel to work in these businesses, we are continually expanding state employees. Not too long ago the State Comptroller who happens not to be a member of the party who holds the Governor's Office complained about the number of state employees that are continually being added to the state payroll. It's this type of legislation that adds to the bureacracy, adds to more people being put on the state payroll and it continues to be an afront to the citizens of Illinois. Reduplicating efforts that are already being duplicated by other agencies and it's just more bureacratc garbage that's being forced upon the taxpayers of Illinois. And on the merits of this legislation alone, and because of the Amendments that have been placed on this Bill, this Bill deserves to be overwhelmingly defeated by the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."



Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have to disagree with my colleague who just spoke on this Bill, not at the bottom line, which is of course, to oppose this rather silly thing, but when he says that this Bill became more ludicrous with the Amendment we put on the floor of the House, he's absolutely totally wrong. When this Bill was heard in Executive Committee, as originally filed, nothing could have been more ludicrous because the intent of this Bill was to encourage people with state aid to get into the small grocery business. Now, that has been dropped with Amendment #1. And so we are now faced with the prospect of voting on a Bill which of course, has not been heard in Committee. This is the first hearing really except for the.. the brief time last evening before it was lapped out of the record, that this Bill will have been heard. Now, Representative Simms has pointed out many, many flaws, drawbacks and idiocies of this Bill and I really can't expand on that. But he was absolutely wrong when he said the Bill is more ludicrous now because, as I said, nothing could have been worse than as it was originally put in. So, of course, he's right, though and we should oppose it."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before we proceed with the Bill. I would like a ruling from the Parliamentarian as to where we stand on my request that we need a fiscal note on this Bill, one prepared by the Department of Commerce and not by the House staff or the House Sponsor himself. "

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Hallock? The fiscal note was requested on May the 20th. A fiscal note was filed May 20th. The Bill was moved to Third Reading. There is a procedure to challenge a fiscal note, whether it's sufficient or not and it's not in debate when the matter is coming up for Third Reading. Now the question is whether or not



this Bill is going to pass and it has 89 votes or it doesn't have it. I mean now, there's no sense of haranguing the thing about fiscal note. The statutes are pretty clear, you know, and maybe you have some part in passing them. I don't recall when that law was passed, but that's the rule and it's pretty clear. I don't see any point... There's a lot of people that have Bills that they want called. I'm trying to reach everybody and it seems to me that we should proceed with Mr. Slape's motion to adopt.. to either have it or he doesn't have it. Now, Representative Vinson."

Hallock: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "I would agree with you that a fiscal note has been filed, if you define a fiscal note. To me, the statutes as you said are very clear and they say that a fiscal note must be prepared by the proper agency. What you're saying today by your ruling is this, that in the future a fiscal note is any sheet of paper which has prepared and written on it 'fiscal note'. And any of us can do that ourselves. If we're going to comply with the statutes, we're going to have to have the statutes met and have fiscal note prepared by the proper agency. To me, to have a sheet of paper which has, 'fiscal note', on it, is not a fiscal note to me. And therefore, this Bill is not in proper shape."

Speaker Redmond: "So then you vote against it. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "I'd like to request a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins,"

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, maybe I missed something, but is what you're saying to Representative Hallock, is despite what the statutes say, you're going to rule otherwise? In essence, is that your ruling?"

Speaker Redmond: "I'm saying that the Bill is in proper order



on Third Reading, as far as I'm concerned at the present time. The necessary procedural steps were not taken. You have a simple solution here and that's that you vote 'no'.."

Collins: "Well, you're right..."

Speaker Redmond: " Call your attention to the fact that many Members have been here a long time. We still have a lot of work to do. I'm trying to reach everyone. And you have a simple solution to this problem."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, you're right. The necessary procedural steps were not taken. The proper fiscal note was not filed. The statutes, to the contrary, notwithstanding. So you.. you are saying that you place yourself above the statutes and are ruling the statutes are out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "No. No. I feel that I'm bound by the statutes, bound by the rules, the same as everybody else is here. Sometimes we forget that, but that's the rule. Third Reading is not .. it's not timely. Representative... I think we ought to proceed. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is no different than the proceeding that we were put through last evening on Representative Ewing's Bill. Exactly the same situation..."

Speaker Redmond: "I wasn't in the Chair, as I recall. But.. they tell me.. they tell me that the Chair ruled against the objection last night. Same thing. Send out the State Police. Representative Taylor."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I think we're there already. Representative Slape, to close."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I'd like to address the comments that were made by the illustrious Gentlemen from the 34th District and the 42nd District





who apparently in their wisdom forgot to read this Bill. First of all, the Bill does not set up a Commission. It sets up an Advisory Committee. It does not.. It does not make appropriations to any university and it does not include state universities, It's all private universities, all appropriations are made to the department. People will use the facilities that are set up through the university, will be charged a fee in return for the services that are rendered to them. And also the original Bill did not deal with setting up grocery stores. It dealt with the pilot program, which I'm sure the Gentleman is well aware of and he once again tried to muddy the issue. Now this year... Is the General Assembly going to recognize the small business in the State of Illinois has a problem and are we going to come to their aid? And I would ask for a 'yes' vote on this Bill. 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 Keane, are you seeking recognition? "

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to point out on the merits of this Bill an important analogy. What we are attempting to do is what agricultural schools throughout the United States have done for the farmers and for ~~agr~~business. They provided expertise. Under the Representative's Bill, one phase of it is the utilization of the same expertise, the academic expertise, the state has available to it. In other states, have already seen this and have done an outstanding job in utilizing the business expertise that exists in our universities and in our institutions of higher education to aid small business. It is proved very, very successful in these other states. I think we should keep it for Illinois. We do have a few universities that are



doing this on their own right now. I think if we standardize it, it will help out the small businessman, especially with the economic situation we're facing in the coming months. I would ask that you support this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 89 'aye' and 72 'no'. And Representative Vinson has requested verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like the record to reflect that I am verifying this Roll Call, not so much because I'm opposed to the concept here, but only the principle we're setting by passing along a Bill which has an improper fiscal note on it..."

Speaker Redmond: "Let the record so show. Request has been made for a poll of the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees; Bluthardt. Catania. Ebbesen. Dwight Friedrich. Katz. Klosak. Laurino. McBroom. Molloy. Robbins. Sandquist. Schlickman. C.M. Stiehl. And, Watson."

Speaker Redmond: "May Representative Leon be verified? Representative Vinson, have leave to have Leon be verified? Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative: Alexander. Balanoff. Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski desires to be verified.. Vinson? Kosinski, may he be verified? Representative Ewell, same request. Representative Donovan, same request. "

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the Affirmative;



Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines.  
 Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan.  
 Hannig. Harris. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Johnson.  
 Emil Jones. Kane. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz.  
 Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz.  
 Madigan. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain.  
 McGrew. McPike. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien.  
 Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dawson, what purpose.. May he be verified, Representative Dawson?"

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the Affirmative;  
 Richmond. Ronan. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider.  
 Schraeder. Sharp. Slape. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor.  
 Terzich. Van Duyne. Vitek. VonBoeckman. White. Willer.  
 Williams. Williamson. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell.  
 And, Mr. Speaker. "

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions of the Affirmative? Representative Bowman?"

Bowman: "How am I recorded as voting?"

Speaker Redmond: "How's Representative Bowman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Bowman: "A careless mistake on my part. Vote me 'aye' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Any questions, Mr. Vinson?"

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Younge?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge is in the center row back there."

Vinson: "People are supposed to be in their seats, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "I know they are."

Vinson: "So is Leinenweber and so is Ronan and so is Collins, Stanley..."

Vinson: "Well, their mistake doesn't justify the others, Mr. Speaker. Representative Sam Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Sam Wolf, is he here? He's in the back."

Vinson: "Representative Williams?"



Speaker Redmond: "Williams? Representative Williams, I hear a voice. Here he comes."

Vinson: "Where? Representative Terzich?"

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Steczo."

Speaker Redmond: "Steczko, how is he recorded? He here? Remove him."

Vinson: "Did you remove Steczo? Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "What did you say?"

Vinson: "Did you remove Representative Steczo?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, I did."

Vinson: "Schneider."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Schisler."

Speaker Redmond: "Gale Schisler here? Schisler here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove Representative Schisler."

Vinson: "Leverenz."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz? How is he recorded? Oh, he's down in front."

Vinson: "Representative Laurino."

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Vinson: "Representative Johnson."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Hannig."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hannig? Here he is."



Vinson: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Redmond: "Farley's in the back."

Vinson: "Representative Dunn, John Dunn."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Doyle."

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

Oh, there he is. Representative Terzich has returned.

Put him back on the Roll Call."

Vinson: "Representative Chapman."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Vinson: "Eugenia Chapman."

Speaker Redmond: "She's there."

Vinson: "Where? "

Speaker Redmond: "It's too bad Ebbesen isn't here."

Vinson: "Representative Braun."

Speaker Redmond: "She's here."

Vinson: "I see her. Representative Bianco."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Bianco here? How is he recorded? Remove him."

Vinson: "No further questions."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I was momentarily off the floor. How am I recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Record him as 'aye'. Representative John Dunn has returned. Put him back on the Roll Call. Representative Farley? "

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Farley recorded?"

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

Farley: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn?"

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just got back. I don't know h



whether I was taken off or not, but I want to be recorded."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't recall what you were. How is Flinn recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Cullerton?"

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Chair. I don't think that Representative Hallock fully understands your ruling with reference to the Fiscal Note Act and I want to make sure that I understand it. Is it your ruling that on May 20th when a fiscal note was filed, that Representative Hallock if he had objected to the fiscal note, should have done that before the Bill was moved to Third Reading on May 20th? Is that what your ruling is?"

Speaker Redmond: "My ruling is that there's a statutory provision to question the sufficiency of the fiscal note."

Cullerton: "And that once that he's failed to do that, it's gone to Third Reading and therefore, he's unable to question the validity of the fiscal note?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, what order of business are we on now?"

Speaker Redmond: "Resolutions. Representative Conti? "

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if you want to wait for the rest of them to come back, let's call a recess for five minutes. We don't want to go into any dissertation about the fiscal note..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bianco has returned. Put him back on the Roll Call. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Representative Huskey wanted to know what order of business we're on. We're on the order of small business."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count? Representative Schneider, how is he recorded? "

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman was removed."



Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Put him back on. What's the count?"

80... Representative Bianco."

Bianco: "Mr. Speaker, record me as 'no' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative Bianco as 'no'.

On this question there's 86 'aye' and 71 'no'.. 72 'no'.  
The Bill, having.... Representative Mulcahey. The  
Bill, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority,  
is hereby declared passed... lost. Representative  
Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an announcement.  
We're through with this right now. Some people came  
an awful long way to Springfield. In the gallery to the  
right is 84 students from the Galena Middle School from  
beautiful Galena, Illinois, 35th Legislative District.  
Chaperoned by Chuck and Chris Cordey. Represented by  
Representative Rigney, Swanstrom and myself."

Speaker Redmond: "3600. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3600, a Bill for an Act to amend  
Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the  
Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten?"

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of  
the House. House Bill 3600 is a corrective measure.  
It corrects a deficiency in the Election Code. Measures  
similar to this have been before this House before and  
have been before the Senate. The Senate has more wisdom  
than we do on occasion and have passed the measure.  
But I think that time.. the time may be right for us to  
review the House's past positions on measures such as  
this. What this Bill does, 3600, it allows people to  
determine ahead of time what primary they would like  
to vote in by enrolling in a party.. in a party primary.  
The Bill also says that all those who voted in the last  
primary in either party would be automatically enrolled.  
Of course, if all of those voted in the next primary, we



would continue to have record primary turn-outs because all those people would already be enrolled. The Bill provides that anyone may change their enrollment up to 28 days prior to the primary election. The Bill also provides that the county clerks and other clerks or officers who do party registration also make available the proper forms for party enrollment and it also includes that at the general elections forms for enrollment or changing enrollment be made available to voters so that they can change their enrollment with ease. History has indicated to us that the best government is that which is provided by a strong two-party system. History, not only in this country, but history in those nations throughout this world. And we have on occasion attempted to debilitate the activities of the two party system. This measure directs itself directly towards strengthening the two-party system. There are a lot of benefits that this measure provides and let me enumerate some of them. First of all, a party primary is a <sup>party</sup> ~~SA~~ election. It is a private election. It is not a public election. It is an attempt by a group of people with similar thoughts and ideas to get together and nominate people with those same ideas to oppose the opposite political party in the fall. You would no more like people to name your selection of officers for political nomination anymore than you would allow the members of the JC's to go vote for officers of the Lion's Club. The matters are similar and they should also be treated similarly. In addition, over the years, and I think many of us have to take concern, there has been undue influence in our selection process by the media. And the media has attempted to nominate, endorse and select candidates for our parties. This selection process should be the province of both political parties. And an enrollment system although not excluding the media would





certainly improve the party's ability to not only select but...and nominate, but also to govern in the future. Third, and I think often overlooked with party enrollment measures, is the fact that they have a tendency to reduce campaign costs. Because, you immediately have available to you a list of those people who would be eligible to vote in party elections. Those lists could be available to the party organizations and can be available to the candidates. You need not then put literature out over tens of thousands or hundreds of thousand of voters, but only target those who are eligible to vote in that election. It would allow you to target as a candidate. It would allow you to reduce costs. And it would prevent surprises from happening such as what could have and did happen in the last primary, when even in my own political party, there were a number of Democrats elected as delegates to our nominating convention and this would not have happened. Even those of you who are independent, who spent lots of dollars trying to prevent Democrats from crossing over into the Republican primary, would not have to bear the cost of that advertising and that extra measure if we had some sort of a protection measure. Let me also point out, for those who argue that it would turn.. turn voters away from the polls or it would reduce the number of people voting in party primaries, that there are nine states which have similar measures. New York state has a measure most similar to the one that is before us in House Bill 3600 and in the last primary in March, March 25th in New York, there was a record turn out of Republican primary voters and Democrat primary voters in that primary with a similar provision. The notion that people will not vote if they have to enroll just does not bear up under what has happened in other states. If you want to allow everybody to vote in a primary, that's fine.



That's the system that Russia has and you know the type of government that they have. We have always been.. We have always been a country that has prided itself on a strong two party system and this measure legitimizes the process and provides us with some safeguards for the party. In conclusion, let me point out that those of us who have worked in the vineyards of a party systems or have been active in party processes that this Bill does something to strengthen that system. It does something to insure not only a good selection process, provide a strong two party system, but it also goes a lot further toward providing that type of government that is best, that that is done by a two party system. And I would solicit your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I reluctantly rise to oppose this primary lock out Bill. I say reluctantly not only because the Sponsor's a good friend of mine, but he could use a win, and I say that in a gentle sense. I'm not going to dwell on the irony of the fact that we..."

Speaker Redmond: "He had Reagan."

Reilly: "Yeah, but Michigan had some... The Chair is not supposed to get involved in the dialog here and anyway... you're..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I think I can correct an obvious error. Proceed."

Reilly: "Which obvious error are you correcting, Reagan or.."

Speaker Redmond: "That he never had a win. He had Reagan."

Reilly: "All right. I won't dwell on the obvious irony of the fact that we're getting rid of the blind primary, but yet, here we're trying to exclude a great many people who might want to vote in those primaries. We really face a very basic problem. I would certainly agree with the Sponsor of the Bill that over the last



few years there have been serious weaknesses in the political parties. I would further agree with him that in terms of good government, in terms of the way government can work in a democracy, in a representative democracy, those parties must be strengthened. And we've made a serious mistake by reforming the parties to death. I agree with him that far all the way. The problem is that we now face a very serious problem here. Basically two ways to go in terms of strengthening those parties. We can try to articulate our philosophy of the common good, if you will. We can try to explain both parties to the people, why it is important to participate in parties. And we can try to persuade them that this is important and that the reforms perhaps have gone too far and that we must strengthen the parties. Or we can respond as Representative Totten is attempting to respond by locking out all those who don't agree with this, by use of the club analogy several times. Well, political parties aren't clubs, at least not if they're to function. The problem, one of the big problems with political parties is that we've treated them as clubs over the last several years. It seems to me this Bill goes in entirely the wrong direction. We have problems now with getting people out to vote in primaries. We have problems now with people thinking the parties are clubs from which they are excluded. We have problems now with people thinking that the parties have become irrelevant to their real needs and their real problems and their real concerns. We must go in the direction of addressing those real problems that people have with the parties. This Bill goes in the other direction, a mechanical direction, the wrong direction. It tries to lock people out of the process rather than welcoming them in. I oppose the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we've been talking about increasing participation of voters by addition, not subtraction. A lot of people, as you know and I know, aren't as interested in politics as we are. And so they don't even make up their minds 28 days ahead of time. They wait until the last week and this way we're closing them out by saying, 'You can't change your mind. You can't listen to what's being said. You can't decide on the issues. You have to go with the way you were registered before.' And in addition there's an Amendment on this which is allowing people now to enroll by postcards. First we can get absentee ballots by mail, now we're going to get enrollment by mail. If this Bill passes, pretty soon we're going to get registration by mail. I think this kind of thing is the wrong way to go. I agree with Representative Reilly, If we want people to participate in party politics, we should make it interesting for them and we should not close them out because they don't know their minds four weeks ahead of time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the last two speakers, in my judgment, have very succinctly outlined valid, sound reasons for opposing House Bill 3600. But I would like to add one more important point, particularly for the people on my side of the aisle. The proponents of this legislation contend that it's good for political party. They've gone so far as to say that political... that primary elections are kind of a private sort of election. Needless to say, I vigorously disagree with that position. But, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would like to point out to all of you that just two weeks ago in Peoria,



at the Republican State Convention, on a Roll Call vote this proposition was defeated overwhelmingly. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members, if this is so good for parties, and party politics, why then did our convention in an overwhelmingly Roll Call vote reject it? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker and Members, that they rejected it for the reasons stated by prior speakers. That they want to open up the parties to more participation and that adopting this kind of legislation would not promote that kind of cause. And, so Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to oppose this Bill and I'm going to once again vote here on the floor today as the majority of the Republicans did at our State Convention in Peoria."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 107 'aye' and 34 'no'. And the motion.. the motion carries. Representative Totten, to close. Be able to explain their vote."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm surprised... I'm not surprised I guess at the normal amount of opposition that this Bill engenders. Because there are.. there are many who may want to use party labels for other things. But I think a strong party ticket is important and that people who want to use the Democratic party label and the Republican party label ought to do so through a legitimate process and that's what this Bill is about. It's a Bill to strengthen those two party systems and especially the system in Illinois so that we can have better government in the long run and I think that's



something that we collectively all want. This Bill is aimed at that."

Speaker Redmond: "Explain your vote, Representative Ann Willer. Well, let me explain that. We can't do anything else. The machinery has gone Democratic for a moment so..."

Willer: "Well, we're just voting on.. No, I don't want to explain my vote on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Ultimately he just explained his vote. I know it, but I can't take the vote here. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote.. Wait a minute now. I can't put the question because we can't take the Roll Call. So.. the machine is misbehaving.."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, can I have the same Roll Call that's up there?"

Speaker Redmond: "Leave to have the same Roll Call? Objection has been raised. Representative Willer, go ahead."

Willer: "Well, in explaining my vote, we shouldn't cut off debate. We had to listen to the same silly speech this year we heard two years ago from the same Sponsor. It's a lot of hogwash. I will repeat what I said two years ago. The people don't want this Bill. The only people who want this Bill are people who are active in parties, are not interested in good government one bit. They're interested in making a closed corporation of the parties as they were many years ago. A Republican precinct captain said to me 20 years ago, when you get a primary turn out more than 15 percent of the voters, it's bad because you can't control it. This is exactly what the Sponsor wants to take us back to, where the few people control those who run the primaries. It would lock out the voters. It would lock out good independent candidates who have a chance to run. And there... Let's stop this nonsense about good government."



This is a bad government Bill. Nobody wants it in the State of Illinois. Nobody wants it in my district. And you're kidding yourself if you think the people would be happy with this. They'll be furious."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and particularly, Mrs. Willer, I wouldn't characterize that as a bad speech. I think that Representative Totten's speech is one of the greatest speeches that I have heard in the seven.....<sup>springs</sup> that I have spent here. To take something and suggest.. Now usually we vote against democracy here, but we rarely speak against democracy. But the candor that Representative Totten has had in speaking against the whole democratic process and making it sound logical and believable, I think is a salute to his mastery of the English language. It is a great speech, Representative Willer. It is an absurd Bill. His conclusion's absurd. But the speech, the speech, Mrs. Willer, is a great speech. A great speech if you hate democracy, it's a great speech. I think I'll probably vote 'no' if the Board gets ready."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell. Representative Totten, first yes. Been mentioned in debate."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My name was mentioned in debate.. Of course, this is no different for democracy than banning marches in Skokie. "

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

Skinner: "I'm really surprised that any Republican would vote for this. With only 22 percent of the electorate identifying with the Republican party, we can't afford to lose anybody, even if they sneak in once in a while every four or eight years."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birkinbine."



Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Some of the prior comments beg a reply. What we're talking about here is a primary. Now, some of the earlier speakers were very entertaining in what they said, but they're wrong when they're talking about the Democratic process and speaking of the primaries as though it's a general election. The definition of a primary is a local meeting of voters of a given political party to nominate candidates; of a <sup>given</sup> political party. That's being totally forgotten in all the empty rhetoric against this Bill. "

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Slape."

Slape: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, is this another pro-business Bill? I see all the red Republican lights. I thought maybe this was another pro-business Bill. "

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 38 'aye' and 17 'no'. The Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Representative Ryan on 32... Scribbled over. What is it? 88? It's the third one down."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 32..."

Speaker Redmond: "Want to table that one?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3288, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Retail Installment Sales Act. Third Reading of the Bill ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I'd like to table that Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Collins, you had one on here? What was the number of that one? 3118? Want to table that one? Representative Collins asks leave to table 3118. Representative Schraeder? 2861? You want to table that one? Table 2861. Repre-





sentative McPike."

McPike: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to recommit House Bill 2705 to Labor and Commerce Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Interim Study Calendar?"

McPike: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. It's on Second Reading. It's on page two. Consideration Postponed. On page eight. Priority of Call. First one is House... HBA 2131, Representative Chapman. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, as I read the applicable rule and simple justice would dictate that the call should be on the basis of the time that the Bills reached that order of business. This Bill was heard I think yesterday. There were several Bills heard before that and put on Consideration Postponed and I would respectfully suggest that Bills be called on the order that they arrived at Consideration Postponed."

Speaker Redmond: "The only thing that I have here is on the Calendar which shows that the time that they reported out of Committee. Now, this Bill has come out on 4-17-80 and if you can look in here you'll see that the second one is 4-25-80, the next one was 4-25-80 and that's the only guideline that I have under the rules so that's the order.."

Walsh: "Well, the Clerk with very little difficulty, Mr. Speaker, could give you that order. "

Speaker Redmond: "I think we'd waste more time that way than we do this way. I haven't the slightest idea... this is a random sampling. I don't have the slightest idea what comes up on this. I think we'd better go this way. 2131, Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we voted on this Bill on Tuesday right at the dinner hour when attendance was not as good as I would have hoped. So, we



fell just three votes short on bringing it back today, because this is an important Bill in efforts to implement the new state Constitution and to help adults complete high school so that they will be able to stand on their own two feet and take care of themselves and their families. Basically what the Bill does is to provide for local planning. We are not superimposing a state program on the local areas, but asking each public junior college Board to set up a council where they would coordinate their activities with the public high schools and come up with plans which would be advisory only and would go to the State Board of Education for any decision making. We do not provide the.. We do not change the basic mechanism for funding of adult education and the cost would be \$420,000 one year course.. cost for getting these planning councils started. I ask for your support for this Bill which will move us in the direction of implementing the new Constitution."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? The suggestion has been made that inasmuch as these Bills have been debated rather fully that we obey the procedure under Short Debate. I don't know whether that's a good or bad idea, but... Representative Hudson in opposition."

Hudson: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't feel that this Bill is one bit better than it was the other day when it was proposed and it was bad then. As a matter of fact, I think it's a terrible Bill. This is, in my opinion, and that of many others, the regional government approach to adult education. There are many of us who take.. find... take no umbrage at adult education as far as it goes, but we do object to moving it upstairs. We do object to putting it on a super-government level which I believe this does. It sets up adult educational planning areas. It would take areas outside of community college districts and



those that don't fall within the districts would lock them into a district. It establishes community college not only.. it establishes the area planning.. area planning councils, and these councils become responsible for the area plan for adult education. Now, if you don't take my word for it, I'll simply read to you what it says in Section 4 of the Amendment, 'local educational agencies shall provide for adult education as specified by this Act and the rules and regulations of the State Board of Education and in accordance with the plan development, the area planning council in their respective planning areas.' I submit to you, colleagues, that this is not local education. This is not local control. This has nothing to do with our local School Boards. It moves planning upstairs, up into the super-government echelons. It overlays another .. what should I say? It imposes a layer of educational bureaucracy over and above what we already have. It's a super-imposition of bureaucratic control over our educational processes as I see it. This, I think is a danger. It is loss of local control over this phase of our education. And I think it's a dangerous way to go. If you want to go, if you want to implement regional government, in the educational area, then go ahead and vote for this. That's exactly what you're doing. But I urge you to think carefully about what you're doing and I further urge you to vote 'no' on this questionable bad measure."

Speaker Redmond: "The question, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, if this Bill gets 89 votes... All right. Call for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "I'm afraid that I'm unable to grant you that request because Representative Walsh preceeded you in the request."



Hudson: "Oh, good."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis. "

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In a rare violation of the rules, I'd like to introduce to you the Zion Lutheran eighth grade class from 'Beecher, Illinois', my home town up there. Represented by Art Bloom, the principal, and a lot of very lovely mothers from Beecher, and a bunch of great kids. They're represented by Representative Van Duyne, Leinenweber and myself."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallock take note. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 106 'aye' and 45 'no'. Representative Walsh has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative... Representative McAuliffe? Well, we can't take this one. That's the problem. Representative Walsh, will you come up here? I'll give you a copy of the one from which to work. Representative Walsh? It's.. Will you... It's the Roll Call for you to work on this verification. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Barnes. Bluthardt..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman, what's your problem? May he be verified? Yes. Schraeder, for what purpose do you arise? Representative Schraeder is 'aye'. Now, proceed with the poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bluthardt. Borchers. Ebbesen. Hoffman. Katz. Klosak. Laurino. Leverenz. McAuliffe. McBroom. McCourt. Neff. Polk. Robbins. Sandquist. Schisler. Schlickman. Stearney...."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request."

Speaker Redmond: "Did you withdraw your request after you saw that Roll Call? On this question there's 106.. 107 'aye' and 45 'no' and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 2822, Lechowicz." Taylor is on deck. Lechowicz."

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



the House. House Bill 2822 would remove the state sales tax, will be reduced from three percent to two percent on food for human consumption. Basically just home consumption, effective January 1st, 1981. Not affected by this reduction are alcoholic beverages, restaurant and carry-out foods. And also at the same time, the state and local taxes are totally eliminated on prescription and nonprescription medicines and drugs, medical appliances and insulin, urine testing materials, syringes and needles used by diabetics. Also effective the same area will be change in the Income Tax Act will be revised to increase the local government distributive funds formula from one twelfth to one <sup>eleventh</sup> for counties and municipalities. The basic provision that was originally contained in House Bill 2822 as far as a reimbursement for the RTA was removed by the Amendment #6 and I believe that with the removal of that item, it should have the support of the House to pass 2822."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've passed out several measures that have given tax relief in the area of sales tax. This is duplicative of those and it goes much farther. This will allow for the state to reimburse local governments for their share of one cent which the Sponsor will be taking off. It also allows for an overdistribution from the local government distributive funds under the terms of this Bill. It was bad when we voted on it the first time. It's still bad. And I would encourage a 'no' vote."

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

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the revision in the revenue sharing formula is necessary to cover the losses of municipalities and counties from the total sales tax



exemption on drugs and medicine. That's the only reason why the .. that provision exists in the Bill. And I believe it's a very fair and equitable provision because under this Bill, this is the only Bill that totally exempts drugs and medicines and medical appliances from the sales tax. But it also has the necessary procedure involved so that local municipalities are not seriously affected with the removal of the sales tax on those items. It doesn't have any replacement at all on the reduction on food from three percent to two percent. So the previous Gentleman was in error in that aspect. And I personally believe this is a good measure and deserves your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer, are you seeking recognition? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 93 'aye' and 44 'no'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is... Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "My light was on before you announced that and I wish to request a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. On this question there's 93 'aye' and 44 'no'. The Gentleman requests a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Just want to tell you that it's my.. when we get through with Consideration Postponed, I intend to call Constitutional Amendments, Third Reading, House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 1, so you'd better be... stay here until we get to that order of business. Don't leave. you may have somebody vote your switch if you're not careful. Just stay here. Representative Schraeder. Record Schraeder as 'aye'. The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees; Barnes. Bluthardt. Borchers. Brummer. Capuzi. Casey. Christensen. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Dwight Friedrich. Grossi. Hoffman.



Johnson. Katz. Klosak. Laurino. Mautino. McBroom.  
 McCourt. McGrew. McMaster. Molloy. Reed. Robbins.  
 Sandquist. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Schuneman.  
 Stanley. Stearney. C.M. Stiehl. Van Duynes. Watson.  
 White. Wikoff. Winchester. And, J.J. Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite, for what purpose do you arise? Satterthwaite, 'aye'? Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Leave to be verified, please."

Speaker Redmond: "May she be verified? The answer is 'yes'. Representative Jane Barnes, 'aye'. Yes, verify the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Balanoff. Barnes. Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Boucek. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Bullock. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Davis. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Dyer. Ewell. Farley..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representatives Capparelli and Terzich desire to be verified. Is that all right? Ewing, verify Capparelli and Terzich? Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Griesheimer. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kucharski. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Macdonald. Madigan. Margalus. Marovitz. Matijeovich. McClain. McPike. Mughalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Piel. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Schraeder. Sharp. Slape. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Totten. Vitek. VonBoeckman. Willer. Williams. Williamson. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Christensen, for what purpose



do you arise?"

Christensen: "Would you vote me 'aye', Sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Christensen, 'aye'. Any questions?"

Ewing: "Could. Mr. Speaker, could we have a count as we start?"

Speaker Redmond: "96 'aye'. Representative Mautino, 'aye'.

W. That's 97. Representative Brummer, 'aye'. That's 98."

Ewing: "Representative Balanoff."

Speaker Redmond: "She's here. Down in front."

Ewing: "Representative Boucek?"

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

Ewing: "Representative Bianco? Representative Bianco?"

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ewing: "Representative Cullerton. He's here. Representative Davis?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis is in the gallery."

Ewing: "Is he on the floor, Representative Davis on the floor?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, in front of me, two feet. Doesn't say which floor."

Ewing: "Representative Dawson."

Speaker Redmond: "Dawson's here."

Ewing: "Representative John Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "Down in front here."

Ewing: "Representative Kulas."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was that?"

Ewing: "He's here."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Ewing: "Representative Kornowicz."

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

Ewing: "Representative Kane."

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





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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ewing: "Representative Harris."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. Can't see him. He's got that subdued coat on."

Ewing: "Representative ... Representative Greiman."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Ewing: "Greiman."

Speaker Redmond: "Greiman? Thought he had requested to be verified."

Ewing: "I think that was on the previous one."

Speaker Redmond: "It was on the previous one?"

Ewing: "Yes, it was."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. "

Ewing: "It absolutely was.."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk advises me it was on the previous one. So, we'll remove him."

Ewing: "Representative V.F. Frederick."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Virginia Frederick? How is she recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove her."

Ewing: "Representative Leon."

Speaker Redmond: "Leon's here."

Ewing: "Representative McPike."

Speaker Redmond: "McPike is here."

Ewing: "Representative Piel."

Speaker Redmond: "Piel is here, he's talking to Representative Boucek."

Ewing: "Representative Ronan."

Speaker Redmond: "Ronan's right in front in the blue shirt. He's ready for t.v."

Ewing: "Representative Schisler."

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

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



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schisler is in the back."

Ewing: "Representative Sharp."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Ewing: "Representative Steczo."

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ewing: "Representative VonBoeckman."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Ewing: "Is he here?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah." "Raise your hand and stand up, Representative VonBoeckman."

Ewing: "Representative Yourell."

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

Ewing: "Representative Beatty."

Speaker Redmond: "Beatty? He's in his seat."

Ewing: "Representative Bradley."

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

Ewing: "Representative Breslin."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Breslin? here? How is she recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove her."

Ewing: "Representative Darrow. He's here."

Speaker Redmond: "Darrow's here. He's the big, tall fellow there."

Ewing: "Representative Doyle."

Speaker Redmond: "Who are you looking for?"

Ewing: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. Any further questions?"

Ewing: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Breslin has returned.

Put her back on the Roll Call. Mulcahey? Representative Mulcahey, for what purpose do you arise?"

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, change my vote to 'no' please."



Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman to 'no'. Representative McGrew, 'aye'. McGrew is 'aye'."

Ewing: "Representative Getty."

Speaker Redmond: "Getty is here."

Ewing: "Representative Goodwin."

Speaker Redmond: "Goodwin is here."

Ewing: "Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Ewing: "Jaffe."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Jaffe here? Here he is."

Ewing: "Representative Slape."

Speaker Redmond: "Slape is here. Slape is there."

Ewing: "Was he here, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Mautino?"

Ewing: "No, Representative Slape."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Ewing: "Representative Kosinski."

Speaker Redmond: "Kosinski's here."

Ewing: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. Anything further?"

Ewing: "I think we rest have them here."

Speaker Redmond: "You what?"

Ewing: "I think we must have 89 here."

Speaker Redmond: "That's what was on the Board."

Ewing: "Well, I know sometimes the Board.. the machine gets messed up though."

Speaker Redmond: "We fixed it today though. 93 'aye', 45 'no'. And the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2220. Representative Taylor. Representative Cissy Stiehl, Sumner, Tuerk, Schraeder, Kent, Ralph Dunn, and Younge are on deck."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2220, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House."



This, too, is one of those Bills that came up at the dinner hour just a couple of days ago and the House was not in attendance. I feel that the Bill was thoroughly discussed and as of yesterday, I tried to correct some of ~~the~~ problems that have been pointed out in the Bill. And that was just more or less clarification of language that I have already agreed that I will put on in the Senate once this Bill passes out of here. This Bills deals with Hospital.. in similar conditions, County hospitals throughout the State of Illinois. It raises the eligibility rate and it also creates a mechanism for the reimbursement formula at Oak Forest Hospital which is badly needed in Cook County. That reimbursement now at the present rate is for nursing homes and not for hospitals and that changes what we are trying to request here. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I solicit your support for House Bill 2220."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Who? Pullen? Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to remind you that this Bill still costs the 313 and a half million dollars that it cost when we defeated it yesterday. I urge you to vote 'no'."

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 Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill will not cost 313 million dollars this year. The only thing that this Bill will cost is from 25 to 30 million dollars. It's a start up program and I think that we are going to have to do something about hospitals that in similar situation as county hospitals throughout this state. This is the start to that program and I solicit your support for House Bill 2220."



Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 79 'aye' and 72 'no'. Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Poll the absentees, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Verification if it reaches 89 please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Bianco. Bluthardt. Borchers. Christensen. Ebbesen. Gaines. Greiman. Kane. Katz. Klosak. Laurino. McBroom. Meyer. Molloy. Robbins. Sandquist. Schisler. Schlickman. Schuneman. Stearney. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Totten. Williams."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten, 'no'. Representative Gaines, 'aye'. Representative Williams, 'aye'. McGrew, 'aye'. Wait a minute now. McGrew, will you tell me what we did here? "

McGrew: "Mr. Speaker, please change me from 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew desires to be changed from 'aye' to 'no'. Anything further? Representative Van Dwyne, 'no'. "

Clerk O'Brien: "'Aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "79 'aye', 75 'no', was it? This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Number 4... 2858. Jane Barnes on deck."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2858, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cissy Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2858 was heard the other day and it allows Illinois only two breweries to qualify for an exempt.. an existing exemption that is already in the statutes. It's a matter of public policy. It does not in any way affect the



income tax, the sales tax, or the real estate tax that these two breweries pay. It's very important to my city and I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I apparently was on the phone and didn't realize that we have the brewery tax break Bill here. I would remind people that this is going to give about \$930 per employee at the 'G. Heileman Brewery' in Bellville, per year. Now the money that Wisconsin Steel is asking for, or the Sponsor<sup>S</sup> of Wisconsin Steel Bill are asking for, and the money in which the Chrysler Corporations' Sponsors are asking for is just a one-shot loan. This is a gift. It's going to cost money every year. And again, I would suggest that if we want to abolish taxes for business, we probably ought to amend the State Constitution so we don't have to have any taxes for business. It would be much better than passing this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to just point out a couple of things and I'll be brief cause we're all anxious to leave. But there are different, approximately a thousand employed, direct employees involved in this transaction. There's a 16 million dollar payroll to the greater central Illinois area. But beyond that I think it's important for two other reasons. First of all, every product with the exception of one that goes into the manufacturer of beer in Illinois, are Illinois grown or manufactured products. The only exception to that is hops and that comes from the State of Washington. But you're talking about corn, You're talking about barley, sulfuric acid, pure



water, the molting process. And by the way, molting process is being done in the area too. But let me point out that all the labor unions that are concerned about employment are certainly interested. But let me just read very briefly a short note that was received from the Mayor of the Village of Peoria Heights where the brewery is located and it's a very simple explanation. And I think it speaks well for the brewery proprietors. 'The Pabst facility in Peoria Heights is important not only from the tax base and water sales point, but ..... prospect as well.' Many times a brewery has been the effort and support that has spelled the success of various community projects. Their failure to conduct business in Illinois due to excessive tax burden could seriously damage the local economic environment. And so for that reason, I would ask for a few more votes so we can maintain a plant in southern Illinois and in Peoria Heights, Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steele."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my 'yes' vote I would like to urge some more 'yes' and green votes on this measure. It does not cost the state anything because if these are not in business, there's not going to be any state taxes to collect and I want to point out that if the jobs are lost in these only two industries, there's not going to be the income tax brought in that is presently being brought in. There's not going to be sales tax brought to Illinois that is now being used to purchase goods and services in these areas. I think the state is going to be the loser. I think the jobs are going to be the loser. I think that business is going to be the loser if we don't pass this needed legislation for a very distressed part of our area and I urge more green votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative



Huskey."

Huskey: "Here we go again, if a business isn't capable of surviving on its own, I think we'd better get into the business of helping <sup>everyone</sup> Wisconsin Steel. We'd better go back and reconsider all those other Bills because I think the time has come in the way of thinking that we'd better just let business roll on its own free way, have bad management, go under and come to us for help and we'll be glad to help them. I want a verification, Mr. Speaker, if this receives 89 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think we're getting the issue a little mixed up here. Actually already the General Assembly has adopted public policy position as of two or three years ago when they did allow certain breweries in the state this little tax relief. I think it's been established. It's a matter of equity. It's not so much a matter of whether these two are really going out of business, although this will help them stay in and become more vital to the community and to the state. But I think it's a matter of equity. And I think that's what the issue is here. We've already passed a Bill which gave certain breweries a little tax relief and I think we should allow the same right to not only Pabst, but also Heileman. I would urge a few more green votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, I did not like the way you .... When my Bill was called here, Lechowicz's Bill before mine a few moments ago, 2822. I did not like the kind of help that I got from Members on both sides of the aisle on the Bill on Cook County Hospital. And I said then and there to some of my Members here that that was the straw that broke the camel's back. And if we don't get this House





in order, from this day forward, you won't have the support of Jim Taylor and Jim Taylor can be harmful to an awful lot of good Bills in this House because I am tired of the way it's being run. That was a Bill that would serve this entire State of Illinois. And you did not give me the help that I should have gotten for it. But on this one, I'm serving notice now, I'm going to pass this Bill out of here, but from this day forward, Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, you'd better watch me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, since this will be a vote of record, I feel I must do as my good friend, Bernie Epton so frequently does, I must announce a conflict of interest. However, I'm voting my conscience. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, contrary to popular rumor, I do not have a conflict. I drink Budweiser."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who... Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I'll change my vote too from 'no' to 'aye', but I didn't know I was drinking sulfuric acid when I was drinking that stuff."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Huskey. Huskey on Hoffman's microphone."

Huskey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I still request a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "You'll have it. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 95 'aye' and 54 'no'. Representative Huskey requests a verification of... He's withdrawn the request. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby... Representative Epton as 'aye'. Is hereby declared passed. 3580, Representative Barnes. Representative Van Duyne."



Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to have leave of the House to waive the appropriate rule to be voted 'aye' on 2822 please?"

Speaker Redmond: "There's a form down here. They tell me it's verified..."

Van Duyne: "That was a verified Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "3580, Representative Jane Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to speak in favor of House Bill 3580. Since this Bill has been discussed and debated at great length I will keep my remarks brief and to the point. As a result of the lengthy debate on this Bill, it has been amended down to meet every legitimate question raised. It has been changed from ten miles beyond the district boundary to five miles from the student's home to the adjoining district. It has been changed from transportation to all districts to transportation only to adjoining districts. It has been amended to make sure that no district which does not transfer public school children will have to transport nonpublic school children. It has been amended to operate only when six or more students request transportation to an adjoining district. Finally, it has been amended so that the state will fully fund this Bill, thus keeping an undue burden from the local School Districts. All legitimate criticisms have been addressed and I would request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Would the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Barnes: "Yes."

Yourell: "Representative Barnes, you indicated to me in conversation relative to this legislation that the Governor had given you his word that he would provide the money for this Bill. Is that correct?"

Barnes: "That's absolutely right. At my fundraiser on February



14th, the Governor initiated the conversation and said since I had worked so hard on the House floor, for Senate Bill 101, he suggested I introduce that legislation again and he would be more considerate of it. Two weeks after that, at Representative Pete Peter's fundraiser, he stood at the microphone and before a packed house, again agreed to consider this legislation. So I have no reason to doubt that I have the Governor's support on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Let me... Well, can I.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you. Are you done? He's not finished yet."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell?"

Yourell: "I haven't completed even..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Okay.. Okay."

Yourell: "Even though Representative Marovitz wants to shut me up. I have never attempted to shut that Gentleman up and I do have several other questions. What is the cost of this program, Representative Barnes?"

Barnes: "According to the Illinois Office of Education, I have a fiscal note signed by... signed by Robert Leinenger, 3.9 million dollars."

Yourell: "3.9 million dollars. Now, Representative Barnes, a final question. Two questions, you indicated to me also that if Amendment #7 which was placed on this Bill on Second Reading, which provides for the state funding the program, was taken off in the Senate, that you would table the Bill. Is that correct?"

Barnes: "That is correct, Representative."

Yourell: "All right. One final question. Did the Governor assure you that not only in this fiscal year, but in other fiscal years as well, that he will continue to fund the program and what assurance do we have in any legislation or is that a provision of the Bill that would provide... that this would be a continuing thing with the



Executive Branch and be in their budget each and every year?"

Barnes: "I got so excited when he asked me to reintroduce the legislation, that I didn't ask all those questions. I wish I had."

Yourell: "Well, I'm not asking the Governor, Representative Barnes. He's not the Sponsor, you're the Sponsor and I'm asking you the question. What provisions are there, is there for funding for this legislation next year? Once we start this program, the Governor may be willing to subsidize it for this year. But how about subsequent years when the cost will continue to rise each and every year? What is his position then? Or what is your position?"

Barnes: "Well, I should certainly hope that he would continue to fund it."

Yourell: "All right. Are you willing then next year, if he does not fund it to put an appropriation Bill in?"

Barnes: "Yes."

Yourell: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. The Sponsor's right. We have discussed this legislation and similar legislation many times over the last year and a half or so. Just want to take note of a few things again. That the State Board of Education figure of 3.9 million is a figure that is based on last year's rates as well as the...."

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

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, I thought you ruled that we were going to have one proponent and one opponent on all the Bills on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "We're trying to do it, but that's not in the rules. We succeeded in most cases, but this is a



little controversial I guess. Representative Schneider, proceed."

Schneider: "All right, the assumption then on that 3.9 million I believe, is if the students happen to wind up on the same route, the regular route, that students who are in public schools are attending. Now, I think that assumption based on the language in 3580 and I think in Repres... Senator Geo-Karis' Bill does not fall within that assumption. The other figure in that State Board memo I think runs up to 18 maybe 20 million dollars which is calculated on the special ed kids who are off the regular route in public schools and while being provided with bus service. Now, that figure comes closer to representing what is the reality of the cost of that Bill. Now that Bill again, I mean, that figure again has got to be understood to be based on last year's assumptions which I think was \$600.00 per pupil for special ed kids and \$150.00 for kids who are regular transportation. So, again, before you make your decision as you probably did last week against the Bill, you ought at least the cost factor. The Chicago Tribune did their editorial against this proposal as well and they made I think the mistake of assuming just the figures given in the survey were correct. That, again, I believe is in error and I don't believe you can accept that figure. Recently the ACLU presented me and others I think with an opinion that dealt with the Constitutionality of this proposition and they came down on the side of seeing this as unconstitutional. They did make reference to the Pennsylvania case which so many of the proponents have advocated as a justification for the Constitutionality of a proposal such as this. Now, there is no comparison according to ACLU. They still see it as unconstitutional. So remember what we're saying now. It's very simply that the cost is greater than the proponents would advocate.



It still has heavy unconstitutional overtones and I think we would doing ourselves and our constituents an injustice to offer to .. students for that reason for schools, these kinds of services in the face of the fact that they probably could not be delivered financially and would be found unconstitutional. And I solicit a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have in my hand the fiscal note signed by Robert Leinenger which indicates the cost can vary between five point nine million and 23.7 million. We're talking-not only about dollars and cents here, Ladies and Gentlemen. We're talking about a principle. I don't think there's any question but what this flies in the face of the Constitution, the Constitution upon which we have all sworn to uphold. I also would suggest to you that the State Board of Education has taken a unanimous position in opposition to this Bill as have many other organizations and associations related to education. Not only has the Chicago Tribune editorialized against this particular program, but so has the Sun-Times and so has the Rockford Register-Star and other newspapers around the state. I rise as I rose before this Bill.... I rise now as I did when this Bill came up before to tell you that this is not in the best interest of all the people of the State of Illinois. Not only is it contrary to the State Constitution, but it's contrary to the wishes of the best majority of our people and for that reason, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise to encourage you to vote 'no' on this proposition."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Previous question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes'



have it. The motion carried. Representative Barnes to close."

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that you will be helping many parents with the passage of this Bill. I think you will be furthering the safety of children that are now walking along the highways in downstate Illinois and provide them the same type of safety for all children, whether they go to public or nonpublic school and I would solicit an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all.. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would urge the Members of the House to take a good practical view of this Bill and vote accordingly. We have in this country and in this state a great private school system that has been the backbone of our educational process and has kept a lot of taxes down in the field of education. It.. Just think what would happen if our private schools were to continue to close up at the rate they are closing now. Our private schools would be in a state of chaos. Our tax rolls would be unbelievable. You've got to take a hard nosed look at this thing. You can be as philosophical as you want, but when the private school system is going broke and you're on the verge of having thousands and thousands of children thrown into the public schools and on the tax rolls, then I think it's time to be practical. This Bill has been amended as the Sponsor said. It's been amended to satisfy every objection that was legitimately lodged against it. I think that it deserves favorable consideration. I would urge the Members who are voting 'no' or not voting on this Bill to reconsider. Vote this Bill out. This is very important, legislation. I understand



another Bill similar to this is coming over from the Senate. I happen to think that this Bill is the best vehicle and I would hope that you would join with us in support of this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 89 'aye' and 64 'no'. Representative Schneider has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Barnes requests a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees; Alexander. Bluthardt. Borchers. Bullock. Casey. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewell. Goodwin. Greiman. Klosak. Laurino. Mautino. McBroom. McCourt. Patrick. Pouncey. Robbins. Schisler. Schlickman. Slape. Taylor. White."

Speaker Redmond: "Now, what's the count? Representative Schneider requests a verification of the Affirmative Call. We're starting with 89, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative; "

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Representative Schisler."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How's he recorded?"

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

Schisler: "Please record me as voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "'No', was that?"

Schisler: "Yes, Sir. 'No'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record him 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative; Abramson. Barnes. Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Bower. Bradley. Brummer. Capparelli. Capuzi. Chapman. Christensen. Collins. ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer, "

Brummer: "Yes, may I have leave to be verified please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Cullerton. Darrow. Davis. Dawson. Deuster.





DiPrima..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DeMarco requests leave to be verified."

Slerk Leone: "Domico. Doyle. John Dunn. Farley. Flinn. Dwight Friedrich. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capuzi? Representative Capuzi asks leave to be verified. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Giorgi. Griesheimer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa?"

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded? "

Speaker Redmond: "How's he recorded?"

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

Garmisa: "Will you change that to 'no' please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'no'.

Garmisa. Representative Simms requests to be verified.

Schnieder, Simms verified? Deuster? "

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

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the Affirmative; Griesheimer...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel? He asks leave to be verified, Mr. Schneider. Piel. "

Clerk Leone: "Grossi. Hallock. Hanahan. Hannig..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer. Okay. Representative J.J. Wolf requests leave to be verified. Don't go too far. Don't forget we're going to have Constitutional Amendment 1. "

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the Affirmative :

Harris. Henry. Huff. Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Keane.

Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kucharski.

Kulas. Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Leon. Madigan.

Mahar. Margalas. Marovitz. Matijeovich. McAuliffe.

McClain. Meyer. Mulcahey. Murphy. Oblinger. O'Brien.

Peters. Piel. Preston. Richmond. Ronan. Ryan.

Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Simms. Skinner. Stanley.



Stearney. Telcser. Terzich. Tuerk. Van Duyne.  
 Vinson. Vitek. VonBoeckman. Walsh. Watson.  
 Willer. Williamson. J.J. Wolf. Sam Wolf. Younge.  
 Yourell. And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker, my seatmates have convinced me the wisdom of the green light up there, so will you change me back from the 'no' to the 'aye'? Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Change Representative Garmisa from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Leon, stop threatening him. Any questions? Representative Abramson. "

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, I request leave to be verified."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave to be verified, Abramson? Any questions Mr. Schneider? Schneider."

Schneider: "Representative Bianco."

Speaker Redmond: "Bianco here? He's here."

Schneider: "Representative Bower?"

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Schneider: "He's here. Never mind, Bradley."

Speaker Redmond: "Bradley's in the middle aisle."

Schneider: "Representative Davis."

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

Schneider: "Darrow?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's over here with Jim Rea."

Schneider: "Representative Gaines."

Speaker Redmond: "Gaines? He's here."

Schneider: "Gaines is here?"

Speaker Redmond: "Gaines is here yes."

Schneider: "Thank you. Sparky, you're back on right?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah."

Sphneider: "Harris?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Schneider : "In his chair, I see him. Kucharski."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kucharski is here. The green sweater over here."



Schneider: "Kulas?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kulas is in front. Representative Slape, for what purpose do you arise?"

Slape: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Slape: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record him as 'aye'."

Schneider: "Representative Margalus?"

Speaker Redmond: "Margalus?"

Schneider: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. He's way in the back there."

Schneider: "O'Brien? Representative O'Brien, Representative not the Clerk... back here."

Speaker Redmond: "He's over there."

Schneider: "Thought you'd try to trick me and put the Clerk O'Brien in O'Brien's chair. Representative Piel."

Speaker Redmond: "Piel requested to be verified."

Schneider: "Okay. Thank you. Stearney?"

Speaker Redmond: "How's Stearney... How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Schneider: "Terzich?"

Speaker Redmond: "Terzich, he's over here in front."

Schneider: "Tuerk?"

Speaker Redmond: "Tuerk's in his seat."

Schneider: "VonBoeckman."

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

Schneider: "Birchler?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler back there?"

Birchler back there? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Remove Birchler."

Schneider: "Griesheimer."

Speaker Redmond: "Didn't... Did he request verified.. authority



to be verified? Griesheimer? Yes, the Clerk advises me... He was here at the time I know."

Schneider: "All right. That's all right. No further requests, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count? 88 'aye',... Who? Representative Epton? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton. Representative Epton, 'aye'. On this question... Representative Williamson."

Williamson: "'Present'...."

Speaker Redmond: "Change Representative Williamson from 'aye' to 'present'. Representative Greiman is 'no'. Any further changes? Now, what is the count? 88 'aye', 66 'no'. Are there any changes before the result is declared? This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority... Representative Dyer. "

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, change me from 'no' to 'aye' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Jones."

Jones; "Mr. Speaker, I had given my word on this piece of legislation, but it seems to me there are games being played, not only on this piece of legislation, so change me to 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change Representative Jones to 'present'. Representative Gaines?"

Gaines: "Change me to 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative <sup>Gaines</sup> to 'present'. Now, what's the count? What's the count? 87 'aye', 65 'no'. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. 2837, Younger? Rea, on deck. Representative.. Read 2837. Representative Younger, Representative Schraeder, will you please sit down? 2837. Representative Younger."

Younger: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2837 is a grant of authority to the Fire Marshal, the State Fire Marshal, to



disburse state and federal grants for fire protection purposes to units of local government. When this Bill was heard before there was a question raised as to whether or not the Department of Transportation of the State of Illinois had the authority and also resources to make these grants. I have a letter here from the Director of the Division of Safety, Traffic Safety, advising me that there are no funds and he does not have the authority to make any funds available for fire protection equipment. And, having removed that inference I ask that this matter be enacted into law."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Anyone in opposition? Representative Mahar?"

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a bad Bill, but a wonderful Sponsor, and I would urge your unanimous Roll Call in favor of it."

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

Younge: "The Federal Government can make available grants to municipalities under 10,000 and efforts are being made to expand that authority so that our municipalities over 10,000 would have the right or opportunity to receive those grants. There is pending in the Senate a Bill for \$48,000 for fire equipment and this is very necessary. There are about nine communities over 10,000 in the State of Illinois that have problems in reference to their ability to provide adequate fire protection. Under the Constitution of the State of Illinois, one of the things that we have the responsibility to do is to provide for the safety of the people. And there is a growing inability on the part of larger municipalities to do this. In my area there were about eight little children who were burned to death because



of the inadequate fire protection. We have had firemen to be severely injured because they did not have adequate gear or clothing. This Bill is supported by all of the people involved. It's supported by all the advisory groups, the unions. It's supported by the Office of the Fire Marshal. There is no objection to this Bill. And I ask for your support. In East St. Louis, we have had a situation because of the exodus of population of a one-half decrease in the taxing base. The tax base has decreased from \$178 million down to \$79 million and therefore the ability to provide fire protection has been cut in half. And with that cut in half, that means that the safety of the people.... This isn't a matter of a social program. It's a matter of not only that the people be given adequate fire protection, but there are about four or five hundred businesses in East St. Louis. This is a Bill that will protect and will lead towards the retention of industry. Industry will not stay in a town that does not have adequate fire protection. I have this problem today. The problem is growing in other cities and I ask for your help on this. Government has to provide certain basic things. We have to provide the ability to have safe streets, police protection. We have to have the ability to make sure that people are not burned up, their homes are not burned up. And businesses have adequate fire protection. And it is these reasons that I ask for your help in reference to this matter. And all this Bill is a grant of authority to the Fire Marshal.. to the Fire Marshal to be able to to disburse these funds. And I ask for your help in reference to this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish?"

Younge: "Could I have the other four votes please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did talk with the



Sponsor before the Bill was called and if you'll recall, I stood and said that the Department of Transportation did give out grant monies out of highway safety funds for emergency equipment. It did not include the fire trucks and equipment as I suspected yesterday. I did tell the Sponsor I would rise and say that. The Department of Conservation just to give some credibility to the program currently does the same exact thing as the Sponsor is wanting to do here. But for only towns up to 10,000. So the credibility for the program is there. And I would suggest that the federal money that's available and this year it's \$131,300 and it has been the same for a number of years, comes from the U.S. Forest Services and perhaps in the Senate we can change the language to take it away from the State Fire Marshal's Office and put it into conservation so that cities or little towns over 10,000 people, like 12,000 or 15,000 could apply for the money and have an adequate opportunity to get the same type of help that we currently provide now. "I should urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 89 'aye' and 54 'no'. And the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared... Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Verify it please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber requests a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call: Representative Ewell. Ewell, 'aye'. Representative Young requests a poll of the absentees. Representative Brummer, 'aye'. Please poll the absentees. Representative Macdonald 'no'. Kane, what's that? 'No' or 'aye'? 'Aye'. Representative McMaster, 'no'. Let's proceed with the poll of the absentees and then... McMaster is 'no'. Representative Getty."



Getty: "May I be verified, 'aye'?"

Speaker Redmond: "May Representative Getty be verified?"

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees; Beatty. Birchler.

Bluthardt. Borchers. Casey. Domico. Ebbesen.

Flinn...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capparelli, for what...

Capparelli, 'aye'. Kosinski, 'aye'. Wait a minute now.

We're... Representative Yourell, 'aye'. Marovitz, 'aye'.

Mautino, 'aye'. Terzich, 'aye'. And now proceed with

the ..."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the absentees:

Greiman. Griesheimer. Hahahan. Katz. Klosak.

Laurino. Margalus. McBroom. McCourt. Mugalian.

Mulcahey. Robbins. Schlickman. Schuneman. Stearney.

Telcser. Totten. And, White."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker? Mr.

Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber?"

Leinenweber: "The Senate Rules Committee deserves a Bill like this. I'll withdraw the request."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber has withdrawn his request for a verification. Now, what is the count?

96 'aye', 55 'no', and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

536. "

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 536, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rea."

Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

House Bill 536 is a Bill that certainly will help business and the economy here in the State of Illinois.

If we really want to do something about the use of Illinois coal, this Bill would lower the federal standards to those of the.. I mean the state standards to those of the federal standards in regards to sulfur dioxide





emissions; and this is all that this Bill does. We called it before whenever there was low attendance and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call. I think that this .. this Bill here is one that as we look around and as we see the coal going out of the State of Illinois, and as we see over 20 million tons coming in each year from the western states, we need to do something as an inducement to the use of Illinois coal. This Bill does exclude Chicago, the Peoria metropolitan area and the East St. Louis metropolitan area. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Representative Schneider? "

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members. I know there are individuals; on the Committee on Environment who have probably worked a little bit more intimately with the Bill than I have, but I don't think the Amendment improves the proposal to any great degree. Has this one been amended, Representative Rea? I'm sorry. Is this the amended Bill? Did you amend this?"

Rea: "No!"

Schneider: "Oh, all right."

Rea: "I did not amend it."

Schneider: "So, it's still the same bad proposal that we had before. And I think some of the technical arguments that were offered last week by Representative McClain and others still hold true. I think we ought to take another look. I spoke a little bit on the health aspects and one of the items that bothers me is it's so easy to measure productivity and it's so easy to measure profit. So when we're talking about coal and the value of being able to use some high sulfur coal from Illinois what we're discovering is that you can measure how much that will purportedly improve the economic standing of our state. What we fail to measure, however, and that



we don't put corollary kind of information out on, is the negative aspect and as it affects health. We don't talk about the individuals who have been affected by it, who are burdened by the illnesses of emphysema, and other lung diseases. We can't measure that. And I think we tend to forget it. And certainly it would be nice to talk about the values and the virtues of the economics of this issue, but I think we ought to be very much conscious of the reason for the inception of this kind of legislation and by that I mean, the development of the Environmental Protection Agency, federal and state. The intention is that we have found in our experience over the last couple of decades that America is slowly polluting itself to death. The Environmental Protection Agency, federal and state, have made the effort to reverse that. I think we have succeeded. This kind of law, if it were to be signed, or this kind of proposal, if it were to be signed, would begin to revert that conscious effort by the people of our state to improve the health of our state by opposing this kind of language in the law and as a consequence I would oppose it. I would leave to others in the Committee to speak to some of the more technical aspects of the problem, but keep in mind the health impact that this would have on citizens of the State of Illinois. And I would of course, encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, first of all, I want to request a verification if this Bill receives the required 89 votes. Cause I think as Representative Schneider said and as others said yesterday, during the debate on the Bill that was before us then, that this really is a basic issue that people ought to determine in their own minds as to whether they want to deteriorate the quality of the environment in Illinois."



at the supposed realization of increased coal usage and in fact, I don't think this Bill will do that. But even if it did, I think we've made a significant stride in Illinois and around the country over the last ten years that have kind of become passe and really shouldn't become passe. I think we've got to realize that our environment for the long run and for our children and our grandchildren a clean environment, clean air to breathe and clean streams to.. to flow through Illinois is the most important legacy we can leave to anybody. And the fact that it might cost a few dollars, the fact that it might cost a few dollars for the industry or for the state to realize that kind of a legacy for our children and our grandchildren is something that everybody ought to be willing to pay. And for those reasons and for the reasons that neither the industry, nor the unions, nor the people who are really concerned with the use of Illinois coal, really support this Bill, I urge a 'no' vote on House Bill 536."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McClain on House Bill 536."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen: of the House, as you will recall, last week when we considered this piece of legislation, it received somewhere around 74 votes and the opposition put forth by Mr. Schneider at that time and Mr. Meyer during that week on the health aspects and on the technical aspects of this matter were very appropriate. I guess I'm just standing up to remind you that it received 74 votes and just for your own Committee work, you ought to know that the Coal Owner Association did sign a witness slip in favor of this piece of legislation, although privately they are very concerned that if this Bill would become law, that indeed, it would restrict the mining of coal because it would place the State of Illinois faced with many court challenges until we cleared up exactly what



this piece of legislation really means. Secondly, and more importantly I think for, at least those of us who are concerned about Illinois jobs, the United Mine Workers would not even sign a witness slip in favor of this piece of legislation because they, too, are concerned that if this Bill became law that indeed what would happen is more people would be put out of work. I'd ask you to keep those two things in mind as you consider your vote and remember that a week ago, this Bill was defeated and I would ask for the same thing again and I regret opposing my friend Jim Rea, but that's the way it goes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Giorgi: "The motion was made to move the previous question. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the previous.. The question prevails. Representative Rea to close."

Rea: "I would like to respond and then with leave, would have Representative Winchester who is a hyphenated; Sponsor to close. In regards to the question that was brought up about the UMWA, the lobbyists for UMWA did not testify in Committee. I have been in touch with many of the leaders of UMWA and the locals in the area and if you would take a survey you would find that probably 99% of them are in support of this Bill. Also the Coal Association did testify in Committee in support of it and the Legislative Council report does indicate that there is a wide range of variance in the standards and again let me point out that this would exclude the East St. Louis, Chicago and Peoria areas and with leave I would like for Representative Winchester to close."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Winchester to close on House Bill 536."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of



House Bill 536 because I think it's an important Bill, not only to my area of the state, but to the entire State of Illinois. I've heard mentioned on the House floor concerns about health. I don't think it's ever been proven to this day yet that sulfur is hazardous or harmful to the health. As a matter of fact, not more than a week or two ago it was on a nationwide television program that sulfur has never been proven as being harmful to health and it might have just been a scare tactic to push us into the oil situation that we have today. And I think, I think that's a part of it. The reason why we have the crisis in some of the foreign countries in getting oil is because we're not being to use coal, coal throughout the United States and particularly in southern and central part of the state where we have a high abundance, more coal probably than any other area in the free world. It's a shame, Mr. Speaker, that we have as many as two and three hundred car loads of coal everyday coming from certain points in the State of Illinois into Indiana, so Indiana utility companies and Indiana steel mills and so on can burn high sulfur content coal whereas we can't burn it in Illinois. It's a shame, Mr. Speaker, that we've let ourselves get into this situation where we can't use coal because of silly EPA restrictions that are even higher than what the federal restrictions are and if we don't approve this Bill and if this Bill is not approved this time, it's going to keep reoccurring until somebody does something. And I think everyone of us ought to ask ourselves, 'Why, with all the technology and everything else that we have, why haven't we come up with some reason why we can't burn more coal?' That's why we're paying high utility rates in this state, is because we can't burn coal, Illinois coal which is cheap. It can be transported to all our utility companies at cheaper



prices than what we pay for it by getting it out of state and I think it's time that we woke up to that realization and voted 'aye' on this Bill if nothing else, at least to send a message to the Governor's Office that we're going to continue pushing it. We want something done. We want something done right away and for them to get off their fat duffs and move on it."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 536 pass?'

All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Skinner to explain his vote. "One minute."

Skinner: "Well, I guess I should rise to defend the Governor.

I don't think anybody should suggest the Governor should get off his duff no matter what size it is."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedrich to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there's been more pollution come out of the State of Washington the last week than if we'd burned all the coal in the United States in one day. And I don't know anybody trying to stop that. We ought to get Ralph Nader on that one." We have a new mine 30 miles from my house. The trains go through my town everyday hauling coal to Indiana so they can have industry in Indiana, but not in Illinois. I think it's amazing that our standards in Illinois are so much higher than they are at the federal level that we have to have a whole block of EPA here to run it. Now, we've got to make the choice one of these days whether we ought to be clean or warm. I think we can be both, but it doesn't make sense to be shipping Montana coal and Iranian oil into Illinois."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Lechowicz to explain his vote."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want to point to the Membership an article that appeared in Wednesday's Tribune where it says, 'Uncertain future for Illinois Coal, State EPA <sup>at</sup> odds over air standards.'



It's an article written by Casey Burko and it starts off this way; 'Superstitious miners once believed that women in coal mines were bad luck. Today coal miners believe they are jinxed by something else, environmental regulation. Without any question the Environmental Protection Agency is strangling the coal industry in Illinois said Bob Naron, superintendent at coal mine near Mirissa and St. Clair County. The United States is the Saudi Arabia of coal. With 25% of the world's known reserves, coal reigned as king of fuels for 150 years before it was deposed by petroleum earlier this century.' It also points out that Governor Thompson wants air pollution standards relaxed for 10 or 15 years. He told the American Mining Conference in Chicago recently that environmental enforcement is unreasonable and a weapon that can be used against our economy. I personally believe that the State of Illinois should be in compliance with the federal standards. That's exactly what's contained in this Bill. Based upon the article that I read in the paper I just mentioned and based upon the fact that Illinois has approximately 150 billion tons of coal, we're talking about employing people throughout this state. In my personal opinion I believe that the maintaining of the quality standards that are required by the Federal Government, should be enforced. The EPA presently has raised those quality standards and I think for the economy of this state, we should be in compliance with the Federal Government and if they want to raise them, let everyone do the same. I agree totally with Dwight Friedrich. When you're talking about shipping coal over 1,000 miles so that electricity can be generated it's really a falsehood. I strongly encourage the passage of 536."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kosinski to explain his vote."

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



I'm just as concerned about my grandchildren and the next one. But if we remain within the federal guidelines on EPA controls I see no danger. But it's most apparent to me that in the State of Illinois, we're sitting on more energy than all the OPEC nations put together. It's time we released that energy, use it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Anderson to explain his vote."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, as you know or maybe don't know, I am a metallurgical engineer that spent 25 years in the industry. One of my jobs was h.w I was superintendent of a zinc smelter. Now one of the things we did there was roast 'salerite' which is zinc sulfide. That gives off SO<sub>2</sub> and we converted it to sulfuric acid. Now the particular sulfuric acid plant that we ran there was a lead chamber plant. It was system five. It was the fifth system that had been in existence in that particular area. We originally started making sulfuric acid in the late 1870's. Now, this particular plant was in the northeast end of LaSalle and the prevailing winds were from the southwest. As Betty Hoxsey can tell you, probably some of the best farmland in the state is right in that vicinity. I think that federal standards are all we should have to meet. I think the people from southern Illinois are absolutely right. And I urge you to vote for this good Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bowman to explain his vote for a minute and a half."

Bowman: "No, I just wanted a verification on this."

Speaker Giorgi: "You're requesting a verification? Okay.

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?  
Take the record. On this question there are 100 'ayes', 43 'nays' and three voting 'present'. Representative..  
Someone asked for a verification prior to Representative Bowmar. Poll the absentees. Representative Van Duyne, for what reason do you arise?"





Van Duyne: "I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "For a verification? Bowman requested it."

Representative Johnson, for what reason do you arise?"

Johnson: "Well, I don't think Van Duyne made the request."

Speaker Giorgi: "Well, we have a verification anyway."

Johnson: "Okay."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees; Abramson. Bluthardt.

Borchers. Bullock. Casey. Deuster. Ebbesen. Epton.

Greiman. Hanahan. Emil Jones. Karpziel. Klosak.

Kulas. Laurino. Leverenz. Margalus. Marovitz. McBroom.

McCourt. Patrick. Pouncey. Robbins. Sandquist.

Schlickman. Totten. Vitek. White. Williams. Williamson.

And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Read the Affirmative."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative; Ackerman. Alexander.

Anderson. Balanoff. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler...."

Birkinbine. Bower. Bradley. Brummer. Burnidge.

Campbell. Capparelli. Capuzi. Christensen. Darrow.

Dawson. Dawson. Davis. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan.

Doyle. Ralph Dunn. Ewell. Ewing. Farley. Flinn.

Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Gaines. Garmisa.

Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock.

Hanahan. Harris. Henry. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huff.

Dave Jones.."

Speaker Giorgi: "Clerk, Mr. Clerk, the Speaker wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. He's here."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the Affirmative;

Keane. Kent. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kucharski.

Lechowicz. Leon. Madigan. Matijevich. Mautino.

McAuliffe. McGrew. McMaster. McPike. Mulcahey.

Murphy. Neff. Oblinger. O'Brien. Pechous. Peters.

Piel. Polk. Pullen. Rea. Reed. Reilly. Richmond.

Ronan. Schisler. Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Schuneman.

Simms. Slape. Stanley. Stearney. E.G. Steele. C.M.

Stiehl. Stuffle. Sumner. Taylor. Terzich. Tuerk.



Van Duyne. Vinson. VonBoeckman. Watson. Wikoff.  
Winchester. Sam Wolf. Woodyard. Younge. Yourell.  
And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ralph Dunn, for what reason do you arise?"

Dunn: "I'd like to be verified please, Sir."

Speaker Giorgi: "Does he have leave to be verified? No objections; Ralph Dunn is verified. Representative Conti, for what reason do you arise?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, while we're going ahead with the verification of the Roll Call, before the school children leave, we'd like to welcome the school children from the 'Puffer Heke School' in Downers Grove represented by Mr. Hudson, Dyer and Schneider. They're up on my right hand side of the gallery."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bowman, do you have any questions off the Affirmative Roll Call?"

Bowman: "Ackerman?"

Speaker Giorgi: "What was that again?"

Bowman: "Ackerman?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Ackerman, Representative Ackerman. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Ackerman in the room? Take him off the Roll Call."

Bowman: "Representative Birchler?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Birchler? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Birchler in the room? Take him off the Roll Call."

Bowman: "Representative Burnidge."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Burnidge? How is he recorded? He's in the back of the room, corner of the room."

Bowman: "Representative Capuzi."



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Capuzi? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Capuzi in the room? Take him off the record."

Bowman: "Representative.. Oh, I'm sorry. I see Bradley. Representative Domico."

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

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Domico in the room? Take him off the Roll Call."

Bowman: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Giorgi: "Capparelli's here."

Bowman: "Representative Dawson?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Dawson's in... well here."

Bowman: "I'm sorry. He's here?"

Speaker Giorgi: "In the well."

Bowman: "Oh, I see, right up front. Thank you. Representative Ewell's back I see. Ewing?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ewing? How is Representative Ewing recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Ewing in the room? Take him off the record."

Bowman: "Representative Griesheimer?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Griesheimer. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Griesheimer in the room?"

Bowman: "Representative Grossi."

Speaker Giorgi: "Take him off the record. Representative Grossi, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Grossi in the room? Take him off the record." "Take him off the record."

Bowman: "Representative Hudson."



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hudson? Is... How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "There he is, in the back of the room." There he is in the back of the room."

Bowman: "Thank you. Representative Huff."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Huff? Representative Huff, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Huff is he in the room? Take him off the record."

Bowman: "Representative Flinn?"

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

Bowman: "He's in his seat, right. Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hanahan, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Not recorded."

Bowman: "I beg your pardon. Representative Matijevidch?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijevidch? How is Representative Matijevidch recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Matijevidch in the room? Take him off the record."

Bowman: "Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McAuliffe, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McAuliffe in the room? Take him off the record."

Bowman: "Representative O'Brien?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative O'Brien. How is Representative O'Brien recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Take him off the record. Just a moment, Mr.

Bowman. Replace... Put Representative Huff back on the



Roll Call Huff. And Darrow wants to be recorded as voting 'no'. Darrow, Darrow from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Taylor Pouncey, for what reason do you arise? Taylor Pouncey?"

Pouncey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How am I voting, Sir?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Pouncey? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Pouncey: "Will you please vote me 'aye'?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Pouncey 'aye'. Representative Bowman again."

Bowman: "Thank you. Representative Schuneman."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schuneman? How is the Gentleman recorded?" "He's in the back of the room."

Bowman: "Representative Simms."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me. Restore Ewing to the Roll Call. Representative Ewing to the Roll Call. What was that last one, Mr. Bowman?"

Bowman: "Simms."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Simms? He's here visiting with Hallock."

Bowman: "Stearney."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stearney, how is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Stearney in the room? Take him off the record."

Bowman: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stuffle's in his seat."

Bowman: "Oh, so he is. Representative Totten?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Totten? Representative Totten, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Can't do anything with him. He's not recorded."

Bowman: "Oh, thank you. Representative Woodyard?"



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Woodyard. Representative Woodyard, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Woodyard in the room? Take him off the record."

Bowman: "Representative VonBoeckman."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative VonBoeckman? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative VonBoeckman in the room? Take him off the record."

Bowman: "He's been taken off?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Have you completed?"

Bowman: "No, one more. Representative White."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative White, how is Representative White recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "He's not recorded."

Bowman: "No further questions of the Roll Call."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Williamson, for what reason do you arise?" Williamson?"

Williamson: "I'd like to cast my vote 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "He'd like to be recorded as 'aye'. Von-Boeckman is back in .. Put him back on the Roll Call. Representative Leverenz, for what reason do you arise? Leverenz?"

Leverenz: "Record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leverenz wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Williams as 'aye'. Representative Pullen, for what reason do you arise? Representative Pullen? Pullen?"

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I had to be out of the chamber for a few minutes and I wanted to be sure that I hadn't been removed from the Roll Call."

Speaker Giorgi: "You haven't been removed."



Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Getty, for what reason do you arise? You want to be recorded as 'no'. Getty, 'no'. Representative Huskey, for what reason do you arise?"

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Giorgi: "How is Representative Huskey recorded?"

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

Huskey: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Huskey from 'present' to 'aye'. What's the tally, Mr. Clerk? Hold it, just a moment. Representative Ropp wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Ropp, 'aye'. And, Bell, 'aye'? Bell, 'aye' and Ropp, 'aye'. This Bill, having received 94 verified 'ayes' and 43 'nos' and three 'present', receives the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The next priority of call is House Bill 2051. Representative Meyer Kulas. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2051, a Bill for an Act to establish motor vehicle emission inspections and maintenance program and amending certain Acts herein named. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Meyer to open or Kulas to open? "

Meyer: "I'll open."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Meyer to open on House Bill 2251. (sic)."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2051 is the inspection and maintenance Bill of automobiles for the pollution control devices. It affects only the areas of East St. Louis and metropolitan Chicago. It's a program mandated by the Congress of the United States. Unfortunately we have no choice in adopting the Bill and for that reason alone, I urge its adoption."

Speaker Giorgi: "Who stands in opposition. Is that Represent-



ative Dunn? Representative Dunn in opposition? Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Representative Meyer is just not exactly correct when he says only applies to East St. Louis. It applies to St. Clair County, which includes about ten or 12 small little towns out in the suburbs, way out in the rural area in my district. For this reason alone, if nothing else, why I would oppose this bad Bill. I think we take the cost of what it's going to cost for people to have their automobiles inspected for emission controls and to put on devices that will be required by the EPA and the Pollution Control Board in the nonattainment areas. Going to make it awful expensive and the Bill has some defects in it too, I think, by the fact that if you have an old clunker and it's going to cost \$100.00 or more to fix it, then the Sponsor said, I think yesterday in talking about the Bill that it wouldn't.. wouldn't apply and you wouldn't have to have your car fixed. I think <sup>this</sup> alone is enough to cause some defeat of the Bill. I'd urge a 'no' vote. I think yesterday it got 74 votes, or day before yesterday. That was a few too many. I'd urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Flinn on House Bill 2051."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to clear that up just a bit more, it does affect more than East St. Louis. It affects all of St. Clair County. It affects all of Madison County. It affects all of Cook County. And, it affects the whole nation and for that matter, because there are states all over the nation having to comply with this. It all comes from the 1977 Clean Air Act, passed by the Congress. I don't necessarily agree with it, but the penalties of what takes place if we don't pass it is what's bad. We are subject to being penalized in those areas where there is no construction, no new industry, and all sorts





of aid Bills will be cut off in the way of federal aid. From the highway, sewers, and everything else. I guess it depends upon the U.S. EPA as to how strongly they will enforce it, but eventually we will have no choice but to pass this or some similar Bill before this year is out. If we have not by the.. by the time the deadline arrives, we will be in violation. I.. I am opposed to the idea of big brother telling you what to do, but in this case unless we can get our Congressmen and all 24 of them voted in favor of this incidently, unless we can get our Congressmen to change their minds, we will have no choice but to pass this or some similar Bill. And I think we'd better get it over with now."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kulas to close."

Kulas : "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't want to be redundant. We've debated this issue at length yesterday. I'd just like to bring up a few items, reiterate a few things. First of all, the question here should not be one of sanctions by the Federal Government. The question here is the health and welfare of the citizens of Illinois. We are talking about clean air. Now, we know that the automobile because of the automobile , it produces 80 to 90 percent of the carbon monoxide in our air. Now, this Bill, in this Bill all we are asking is that those people who live in the areas of the State of Illinois which have a big air pollution problem, that for the privilege of driving their automobile, they bring that automobile in once a year and for an annual fee of eight to ten dollars have that automobile tested so that automobile is not polluting the air. This is a Bill for the people. It is a Bill for the future of the State of Illinois and I would ask your affirmative vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2051 pass?' All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and



those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Skinner to explain his vote for one minute."

Skinner: "Well, I certainly am going to verify this if we..

if it should happen to get the 89 votes that the Speaker has ruled that it needs. This is not going to.... This is not the type of Bill that's going to sneak in at the end of the day. I would point out however that if carbon monoxide emission levels are the primary concern of the opponent, that he can mandate the use of gasohol in the six county area, in the Chicago metropolitan area, in the East St. Louis metropolitan area and cut carbon monoxide emissions by 30% according to Dr. John Allen of the Illinois Legislative Council. If there are other things that the Gentleman is primarily interested in such as prostrating himself to federal blackmail, then perhaps those are what the arguments should be limited to."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schraeder to explain his vote for one minute."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, it isn't a question as to whether we want this legislation; it's a question of.. we're being forced to buy it. The Federal Government has mandated this and they can impose sanctions by July 1 of this year if we don't pass this. And I spoke the other day about this Bill. There's three provisions of it. One of them has to be implemented immediately and the other two shortly thereafter. But since we don't have a choice now, we have all three in the Bill, I would suggest to protect Illinois and protect everyone that's involved in this, that we do give the necessary votes. It's extremely important. Under the federal guidelines the EPA has a right to withhold federal construction funds and that's a blackmail situation but it's there. And they have a right to withhold federal sewage treatment and water



construction funds. And that's blackmail too. So what choice do we have? If we're willing to accept and demand federal money then we're going to have to accept some of these guidelines and we don't really have any choice. Let's get the 89 votes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schoeberlein to explain his vote." One minute."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that you advise the Representatives not to vote other people's green lights. I met four people going out of the building; they're about up in Pontiac now and I see their lights are lit. "

Speaker Giorgi: "Your point is well taken. Representative Birkinbine to explain his vote for one minute."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would remind you that this is the Bill that has an Amendment that allows the worst cars on the road to be exempt. If repairing your automobile, the worst clunkers that are putting out the worst amount of pollution is going to cost you more than \$100.00 and you know what a simple tune up cost you now-a-days, well then you're going to be exempt and if that isn't lunacy, I don't know what is. And as far as buckling under to the Federal Government is concerned, if you keep doing it, it's going to keep happening over and over again. Besides, once you stand up to Washington, sooner or later they're going to blink. They've blinked at everyone else. They might as well blink at Illinois."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Anderson to explain his vote for one minute. Anderson."

Anderson: "Yeah. I'd like to read a paragraph into the record from Caterpillar. Caterpillar would be affected by these three sanctions that we talked about. But determination of new construction is most severe. As we've said before, we've already identified a need for about an additional 12 million square feet of manufacturing



space over the next decade or so. That would translate into 20,000 additional jobs. Now, think about that. Right now, they are planning to expand. If we put them into jeopardy where they can't see their way clear I think we may lose these jobs."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Neff to explain his vote."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've heard a lot of talk here about the Federal Government is clamping down on us, so we're going to lose some money. Now any of us who have been around here for a while will recall that possibly 12 years ago, when if we didn't have mandatory inspection of all automobiles, that we'd lose so much money. That's never come to happen. The same way with the billboards. We fell in line with the billboards, removing all billboards. Many states did not. Still have their billboards up. And, as has been brought out here, the motorcycle helmet law was another one. So we sit there and I don't believe we have to worry about losing any federal money. This is something that's just started in a couple of areas, but if it starts there, the first thing you know we'll have it over the entire State of Illinois. So I would hope we would all vote 'no' on this."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hudson to explain his vote for one minute."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to add my voice to those of others that are tired of legislating with a federal gun leveled at our heads; I think maybe the time has come to fire the shot heard 'round the world where we stand up and say 'no' for a change to the feds and let's do it today."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedrich to explain his vote for one minute."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, the fiddlers in Washington are at work and you're supposed to dance because they're



fiddling and they want you to dance to their tune. Now we can go with them and be pushed around by the Federal Government or we can tell these industries to get on the stick and talk to the people in Washington. The place to kill a snake is to cut off its head and the head is in Washington."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kulas to explain his vote, for the last Member."

Kulas: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the previous Members mentioned \$100.00 exemption. A Joint Committee on mandatory fuel inspection and maintenance program studied this matter for over six months. We've seen different programs. Now the average repair cost to make an automobile meet the standards is between 20 and 30 dollars so the reason we put in the \$100.00 exemption is not.. is to make it easier for people who own cars which are the poorer people that can't meet these exemptions, to exempt them. Now, this amount of cars that couldn't meet this \$100.00 exemption would be minimal. It wouldn't hardly affect the quality of our air. Now, I know this is an unpopular decision.. Nobody wants to mandate a program. But it's something that we must do for the future or our children, our grandchildren."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 91 'ayes', and 48 'nays', eleven voting 'present'. Representative... Ralph Dunn, for what reason do you arise? Did you ask for verification, Representative Skinner? Representative Skinner asks for a verification. Let's poll the absentees and proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees; Bluthardt. Borchers. Casey. Deuster. Ebbesen. Epton. Gaines. Graiman. Griesheimer..."



Speaker Giorgi: "Hold it a minute.. Representative Getty would like to be voting 'aye'. Representative Getty? Verified? Does he have leave to be verified? No objections, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Greiman. Griesheimer. Hanahan. Emil Jones. Kane. Keane. Klosak. Laurino. McBroom. McCourt. McGrew. Mugalian. Rigney. Robbins..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Rigney? Rigney would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Rigney, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Sandquist. Schlickman. Slape. Stearney. Totten. And, White."

Speaker Giorgi: "Proceed to verify the Affirmative."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Ackerman. Alexander. Anderson. Balanoff. Barnes. Beatty. Bell. Bianco. Boucek. Bowman. Braun. Bullock. Burnidge. Campbell. Capparelli. Capuzi. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Conti. Cullerton. Currie. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. Dyer. Farley. Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Grossi. Hallock. Hallstrom. Henry. Huff. Huskey. Jaffe. Johnson. Karpiel. Katz. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kucharski. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Madigan. Mahar. Margalus. Marovitz. Matijevich. McClain. McMaster. McPike. Meyer. Molloy. Oblinger.."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Catania requests permission to be verified. Does she have leave? Representative Kosinski. Leave has been granted. No objections. Kosinski and Catania."

Clerk O'Brien: "O'Brien: Patrick. Pechous. Peters. Piel. Pierce. Polk. Pouncey. Preston. Rigney. Ronan. Ryan. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Schraeder. Stanley. Steczo. Sumner. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. Tuerk. Vinson. VonBoeckman. Willer. Williamson. Woodyard. Younge. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schneider, for what reason do you arise? Schneider?"



Schneider: "I'd like to ask Skinner to verify me please."

Speaker Giorgi: "Skinner, he'd like to be verified."

Skinner: "Since he's here so late, would be happy to."

Schneider: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Jones would like to be recorded as voting 'aye', Mr. Clerk. Representative Jones, Emil Jones. "

Skinner: "The way he takes care of his car?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay. Representative Skinner proceed."

Skinner: "I guess Representative Keane has returned to his coat. I see him. Representative VonBoeckman, is he voting? Yes, he is."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative VonBoeckman, how is he recorded Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative VonBoeckman in the room? Take him off the record."

Skinner: "Representative McGrew?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McGrew? How is he recorded?"

Skinner: "Oh, he's not voting. Sorry about that. . ."

Speaker Giorgi: "He's not recorded?"

Skinner: "Birchler?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Birchler, . . ."

Skinner: "Oh, he's voting 'no'. He's got good judgment. Representative Doyle, is he there?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Doyle's in his seat."

Skinner: "Okay, I see his hand. Representative Christensen?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Christensen is in his seat."

Skinner: "Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative O'Brien, how is . . ."

Skinner: "He's in Pontiac, I think. . ."

Speaker Giorgi: " . . .How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative O'Brien in the room? Take



him off the record."

Skinner: "Is he in the city? Representative Steczo?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Steczko? Representative Steczo? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Steczo in the room? Take him off the record."

Skinner: "Is that Representative Satterthwaite over there?"

Speaker Giorgi: "She's in her seat.."

Skinner: "I can't tell with her new hair do all the time."

Speaker Giorgi: "She's in her seat."

Skinner: "Representative Giorgi? Oh, golly you're up there. Representative Hanahan?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hanahan is not recorded. Look at the Board."

Skinner: "Okay. Representative White, is he recorded? No, he's not either."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Representative is not recorded."

Skinner: "How about Representative Rea? Oh, Rea voted 'no' on that's... Representative Ewell."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ewell is on 'present'."

Skinner: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Giorgi: "And I don't have my glasses on."

Skinner: "I guess mine need adjusting. Representative Leon?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leon is near Lechowicz's desk. Representative J.J. Wolf, for what reason do you arise?"

Wolf: "I'd like to change my vote from 'present' to 'no' please."

Speaker Giorgi: "J.J. Wolf from 'present' to 'no'."

Skinner: "Representative Ronan. All I see is his coat."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative... He's at the back of the room."

Skinner: "Come again?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He's in the back of the room."

Skinner: "Oh, where's Representative Keane then?"





Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Keane is not voting, but he's here in the well."

Skinner: "Oh. All right. I'm sorry. I...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is that ... completed, Mr. Skinner?"

Skinner: "Are you kidding? Representative Jaffe?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative... How is Representative Jaffe recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Jaffe in the room? Take him off the record."

Skinner: "Let's see. Laurino and Richmond are okay. Representative Domico."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Domico, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Domico in the room?"

Skinner: "Representative Dawson."

Speaker Giorgi: "Take him off the record. Representative Dawson is in the room."

Skinner: "Did you get Dawson off? Oh, shucks. Representative ...No, he's voting the right way too. Representative Capuzi."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Capuzi, how is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Capuzi in the room? Take him off the record."

Skinner: "Representative Barnes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Barnes? Representative Barnes, how is she recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye', "

Skinner: "Oops, I see her right here."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Barnes is talking to Mr. Willer."

Skinner: "Okay. Is Representative Balanoff hiding over there?"

Speaker Giorgi: "She's sitting..."



Skinner: "Yes, I see her hand. Representative Catania."

Speaker Giorgi: "Catania was verified. She was verified."

Skinner: "Kosinski got verified, right?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Catania and Kosinski together."

Skinner: "Representative Chapman? Chapman?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Who?"

Skinner: "Oh, shucks. Representative Cullerton?" Representative  
O'Brien. Let's see, we got O'Brien, right?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Yes."

Skinner: "How about Katz? Did we get him?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Katz? How is he recorded,  
Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Katz in the room? Take  
him off the record."

Skinner: "Representative McBroom?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He's not recorded."

Skinner: "Oh, shucks."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Skinner. Representative  
McAuliffe wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Skinner: "Who?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Roger McAuliffe wants to be recorded as  
voting 'aye'."

Skinner: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Giorgi: "How is Representative Garmisa recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Garmisa in the room?  
Take him off the record."

Skinner: "Let's see. Is Representative .. He's there.

Is Representative Farley back in the never reaches?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Yes."

Skinner: "Yes. I see a hand. Is Representative Burnidge  
still here? Representative Burnidge."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Burnidge. he's in the back  
of the room."



Skinner: "Oh, he sits back so far. Representative Karpziel."

Speaker Giorgi: "She's in the back of the room."

Skinner: "Oh. Representative Campbell."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Campbell. How is.. Here he is. There he is."

Skinner: "Representative... Let's see if he's voting. No, he's not voting."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Skinner. Representative Polk, for an announcement. Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, while we're here debating on the clean air Bill, we have some future voters; in the gallery, students from the Park Junior High School who are represented by Representative Walsh, Willer and Boucek. And if they could stand here in the back so we could recognize them.."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Skinner to conclude."

Skinner: "I think I pretty well have because I just found Representative Tuerk standing about ten feet from me."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay."

Skinner: "Any other proponents? Anybody I haven't called?"

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

Skinner: "Sandquist shouldn't even be voting. Did Ackerman.. Well, Ackerman's right there. Conti? Anybody else that's not here that wants to voluntarily remove him or herself from the Roll Call?"

Speaker Giorgi: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Representative Leverenz, for what reason do you arise? Leverenz?"

Leverenz: "Record me 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leverenz from 'present' to 'aye'."

Skinner: "I think that's about it. I think the fix is in. Robbins couldn't possibly be voting for this. He's not here."

Speaker Giorgi: "On this question there are 87 'ayes', 48 'nays', eleven voting 'present'. And this Bill, having failed to



receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 2846."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2846, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Henry on House Bill 2846. "

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I yield to the Sponsor of the Amendment to 2846, Representative McPike."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McPike on House Bill 2846."

McPike: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill has been debated a number of times. I think everyone understands exactly what it does. It's a one percent investment tax credit changing to a two percent investment tax credit for industries to encourage them to locate and to expand in Illinois. The investment tax credit applies against the State income tax instead of against the corporate personal property tax replacement. I think the only question is out of what fund can we afford this new program? Every legitimate estimate on this program states that it will take a minimum of three years and probably five years to begin to break even. Now the State of Illinois has \$500 million currently in the surplus. It can afford a program like this. The local units of government, especially local School Districts cannot afford this. They do not have a surplus. There is no way they can finance this program. There's no way they can wait from three to five years to recoup any of their losses. And those are the simple facts. They can't afford it; The State of Illinois can afford it. It's an inducement to business. It's a good change for the manufacturing industries in the state. I would solicit your support."

Speaker Giorgi: " Representative Ewing stands in opposition on House Bill 2846."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this



Bill would take the funds that we've already spent probably five times this Session out of the general fund. The excess funds they continue to refer to are long since gone. This Bill would take the.. and give tax relief out of our income tax fund which has had no increase since it was instituted. There is no way that this Bill can become law. If we pass this Bill I think we are endangering other proposals which could give tax relief to business, other proposals which can give tax relief out of other funds where there is excess funds and new taxes on business. This is a bad Bill. This is not really a pro-business Bill because it can never be enacted into law. And the Sponsor knows that and thought with his Amendment he intends to kill this Bill and the entire content. And I would suggest that we show what we think about business here and that we vote down this Bill and go one with the other concepts which have a chance. And I would suggest a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McPike to close."

McPike: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. About an hour ago we saw the Republican side of the aisle vote down a Bill that would help small business in Illinois. Now, here's a chance for the Republican side of the aisle to vote down investment tax credit for the manufacturing industries in Illinois. If that's how they feel about business, that's fine with the Democratic party. We have put forth a viable program. We have not tried to rape local government which some of the Bills that are on this House floor would have done. This is a viable, sensible approach to investment tax credit. I think it's the only sensible approach that we should take. And I would.. And I think this Roll Call again, as I said the other day, should be very interesting."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2846 pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' "



and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Henry to explain his vote for one minute."

Henry: "Yes, Mr. Speaker..It's very strange that we have talked about a party that is supposed to be for big business, one that has big business.. suspended the Republican party. "

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Slape to explain his vote."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I find it ironic that the party that for the last three or four years have been campaigning on how much they do for business in the State of Illinois are going to pass up two opportunities in one day to support legislation that would help the business climate in the State of Illinois. I'd urge a 'yes' vote on this."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ewing. Are you intending to explain your vote?"

Ewing: "No. Mr. Speaker, I don't want to explain my vote. I just want to be sure I had my request for a verification in if this gets 89 votes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative McPike requests a poll of the absentees. "

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Abramson. Bluthardt. Borchers. Bowman. Bradley. Capuzi. Casey. Catania. Daniels. Deuster. Ebbesen. Epton. Greiman. Griesheimer. Hanahan. Jaffe. Katz. Klosak. Laurino. McBroom. McCourt. Molloy. Mugalian. Peters. Robbins. Sandquist. Schlickman. Schneider. Skinner. Stearney. Stuffle. Totten. Tuerk. Walsh. Watson. And, White."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Simms, for what reason do you arise? Simms?"

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, I accidently hit the wrong button. I want to vote 'no'.. be recorded as 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Simms from 'aye' to 'no'."



Representative Conti, do you ask recognition? Oh. On this question there are 81 'ayes', 69 'nays'... On this.. 60 'nays'. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Representative Conti, for an announcement."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, up in the balcony we have the 'Kinsey School' from the eighth grade class from Chicago's 25th District. They are represented by Phil Bianco, Bob Terzich and Ed Kornowicz, up in the back here."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Eugenia Chapman for an announcement. The next Bill is House Bill 3200."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I would like to suspend the appropriate rule in order that Appropriations II Committee will meet on Wednesday, next week rather than on Thursday. So Appropriations II would be meeting on Wednesday, May 28th at 9:00 a.m."

Speaker Giorgi: "Does the Lady have leave? There being no objection, leave is granted. We'll use the Attendance Roll Call. House Bill 3200."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3200, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Vinson going to open or Representative Bradley? Representative Bradley to open on House Bill 3200."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, thank you very much. I'll be as brief as possible. This Bill is somewhat similar but quite different from the Bill we just defeated. It gives a one percent tax credit to.. It's an incentive for businesses to locate in the State of Illinois. However, the difference is the tax credit would be against the corporate personal property tax replacement as opposed to 2846 in their concept they would be giving the tax credit against the corporate state income tax. We think philosophically



that this is a better concept. Local government we think would be the ones that would benefit directly from new construction, new employees, vendors, service businesses. There would be an increase in retail business and it would definitely expand the local tax base by the building of the new construction and the new businesses coming into the State of Illinois. I will conclude with that. I think it's a good concept and I ask for the support of the House on House Bill 3200."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Gene Hoffman in opposition."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Regardless of where we take the income, it is still going to affect those units of local government which depend to greater or lesser degree on this particular tax program. Let me suggest to you that we do need to encourage and improve the business climate in Illinois. However, we need to develop a balanced program to do this. I had serious reservations as to whether the increased business that we bring into the state will balance out or outweigh that amount which will be lost to local governments who are trying to provide services. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that I have some reluctance to support this kind of a program."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bullock on House Bill 3200."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two brief questions. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bradley? Yes."

Bullock: "Representative, you indicated in your opening remarks that this Bill did not apply to wholesale and retail? Is that correct?"

Bradley: "No, I didn't mention that in.. in my opening remarks. There was an Amendment on the Bill yesterday that Representative Watson offered that I believe did include retailers and wholesalers, but removed the possibility





of utilities being a beneficiary of the Act. "

Bullock: "So this Bill applies to more than just manufacturer-ing. It does, in fact, apply to wholesale and retail."

Bradley: "As amended, yes, Sir."

Bullock: "The Bill, as we're discussing it in its present form applies to wholesale and retail. Representative, you indicated also that this Bill would be a one percent investment credit. Is it not true that it is sort of an accelerated whereas in 1984 it would be a two percent?"

Bradley: "Yes. I did not mention that in my remarks.... "

Bullock: "Does the Bill provide for that in its present form?"

Bradley: "That's correct. I said it was very similar to the one.. to 2846 which that Sponsor mentioned a one percent and then a two percent increase.. going to two percent later on. The difference in the two Bills as I indicated is where the.. the difference in where we give the tax credit, whether it be against the state income tax or the corporate personal property replacement tax. It certainly was not the intent to mislead you in any way at all in the Bill."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have heard this Bill before. House Bill 3200 in my estimation does not deserve the consideration of this House. For two simple reasons; the State of Illinois cannot afford to have as proposed under this legislation an investment credit at this time against the corporate personal property tax. I think logically the approach to have been taken would have been that as described previously by Representatives Henry and McPike and that measure was previously defeated. I further think in the State of Illinois could not afford at this point a \$156 million deficit in whatever fund. And for



those reasons, and for many, many more, I'm sure that most of you have heard, I would certainly have to stand in opposition to House Bill 3200 irrespective of the very fine Sponsor who I'm sure is very much interested in labor and commerce in Illinois."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Vinson to close."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Everybody knows what's involved in this Bill. It's to build increased productivity, jobs and investment in the State of Illinois. The question which has been raised is the question of which tax this credit should be granted against. And I would submit that this Bill permits that credit against the proper tax, the replacement tax. I think if you look at the figures on the revenue, the replacement tax has generated, you will understand why. In the last year collections under the corporate personal property tax the state collected.. the local governmental units collected \$440 million. This year in the first year of collections under the replacement tax, the state will collect and distribute to the local units \$560 million of revenue. That's an increase of 127%. Now, I think clearly we've enjoyed no tax increase under the income tax. The tax increase has come under the replacement tax. And that's where we can afford to make the credit. Furthermore, there's the important question of who derives the greatest benefit from this thing. If the Bill is successful, what it will do is increase property tax revenues, the real estate tax by causing business to expand and by providing that incentive, new plants, new equipment, property tax revenues will be increased and it will offset the tax incentives provided by this Bill. Finally, there's the important question, if you credit this against the state income tax, what you really do is deprive the state of its ability to equalize .. well to equalize



revenues for good purposes among local governmental units across the state. That's the function of the state tax and the state spending. And we can do that now. What this Bill does is to encourage growth where it's needed most, at the local level. It's a growth Bill. It's a jobs Bill. It's an investment Bill. I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3200 pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 100 'ayes', 34 'nays', and three voting 'present'. Representative Bullock, for what reason do you arise?"

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I request a verification."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bullock requests a verification. Representative Terzich wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Beatty. Birchler. Bluthardt. Borchers. Braun. Capuzi. Casey. Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. Ebbesen. Ewell. Flinn. Getty. Greiman. Hanahan. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Katz. Klosak. Kosinski. Laurino. Lechowicz. McBroom. McCourt. Pechous. Pierce. Richmond. Robbins. Sandquist. Schlickman. Schneider. Slape. Stearney. White. Yourell. Mr. Speaker. "

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leinenweber requests leave to be verified. Representative Bullock? Leave, no objection is granted. Representative.... Verify the Affirmative. Representative Yourell would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. "

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schoeberlein would like to be verified. Christensen would like leave to be verified. That's three of them, Christensen, Schoeberlein



and Leinenweber. Proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Ackerman. Anderson. Barnes. Bell. Bianco. Birkinbine. Boucek. Bower. Bradley. Breskin. Brummer. Burnidge. Campbell. Capparelli. Catania. Christensen. Collins. Conti. Daniels. Darrow. Davis. Dawson. Donovan. John Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Epton. Ewing. Farley. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hannig. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Johnson. Dave Jones. Karpiel. Keane. Kent..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Henry, for what reason do you arise?"

Henry: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Giorgi: "How is Representative Henry recorded?"

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

Henry: "Mr. Speaker, I can't vote for this Bill. Record me as 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Henry as 'no'. Representative Farley, for what reason do you arise? Farley?"

Farley: "How am I recorded?"

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

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

Farley: "Would you change that to 'no' please?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Farley, 'no'. Representative Keane wants to be recorded as voting 'no'. Keane."

Clerk O'Brien: "'Aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Boucek asks leave to be verified." Any objections? No objection, Boucek is verified. Ralph Dunn, for what reason do you arise? Want to be verified? Leave, he asks leave to be verified. Representative Kent, same request. No objection, leave is granted. Where are we at, Mr. Clerk? Continue the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Leinenweber. Leon. Macdonald. Mahar. Margalus. Matijevich. Matula. Mautino. McAuliffe.



McClain. McGrew. McMaster..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Leon, for what reason do you arise? How is Representative Leon recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Vote him from 'aye' to 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Meyer. Molloy. Mulcahey. Neff. Oblinger. Peters. Piel. Polk. Preston. Pullen. Rea. Reed. Reilly. Rigney. Ropp. Ryan. Schisler. Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Schuneman."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Bianco, for what reason do you arise?"

Bianco: "Mr. Speaker, can I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman requests leave to be verified. Is there any objection? No objection, leave is granted. Continue."

Clerk O'Brien: "Simms. Skinner. Stanley. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Sumner. Swanstrom. Telcser. Terzich. Totten. Tuerk. Van Duyne. Vinson. VonBoeckman. Walsh. Watson. Wikoff. Williams. Winchester. J.J. Wolf. Sam Wolf. Woodyard. Younge. Yourell."

Speaker Giorgi: "Are there any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call, Representative Bullock?" Representative Bullock on the verification."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Yourell."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Yourell? How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Yourell in the room? Take him off the record."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, could you indicate what we are starting with in the Affirmative?"

Speaker Giorgi: "98 with Yourell off."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 98. Representative Totten?"



Speaker Giorgi: "Television cameras request lights so we're turning the lights on for a few minutes. It can't be done during verification. It can't be done during verification. Where were we at, Mr. Clerk? Where are we at? Totten. How is Representative Totten recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Totten in the room? Take him off the record."

Bullock: "Representative Birkinbine?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Birkinbine. He's in the back of the room. In the back of the room."

Bullock: "Representative Abramson?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Abramson? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Abramson in the room? Take him off the record."

Bullock: "Representative Epton."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Epton. How is Representative Epton recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Epton in the room? Take him off the record."

Bullock: "Representative Margalus."

Speaker Giorgi: "Margalus? Representative Margalus? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Margalus in the room? Take him off the record."

Bullock: "Representative Vinson."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Vinson, he's in the middle of the aisle."

Bullock: "Representative Leinenweber."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leinenweber, he was verified."

Bullock: "Representative Matula."



Speaker Giorgi: "Matula? He's in the back of the room."

Bullock: "Representative Sharp."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Sharp. How is Representative Sharp recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Bullock: "Representative Rea."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Rea. Representative Rea, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Rea in the chamber? Take him off the record."

Bullock: "Representative Walsh?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Walsh? How is Representative Walsh recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Walsh in the room? Take him off the record."

Bullock: "Representative Griesheimer?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Griesheimer? How is Representative Griesheimer recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Griesheimer in the room? Take him off the record."

Bullock: "Representative Neff?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Neff? He's in his chair."

Bullock: "Representative Daniels?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Daniels, how is Representative Daniels recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Daniels in the room? Take him off the record."

Bullock: "Representative Johnson, Tim Johnson?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Johnson, how is Representative Johnson recorded?"

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



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

Bullock: "Representative Catania."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Catania, how is Representative Catania recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Catania in the room? She's on Skinner's lap. Take her off the record."

Bullock: "Representative Capparelli?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Repre... How is Representative Capparelli ... How is Representative Capparelli recorded? Correction... Clear the record..."

Bullock: "Representative Capparelli?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Let me finish. How is Capparelli... Take him off the record. I apologize."

Bullock: "Representative Terzich."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Terzich? How is Representative Terzich recorded? Catania's no longer on Skinner's lap. I apologize. She was not on his lap to begin with. Strike the record."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "How is... Is Representative Terzich in the room? Take him off the record."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I have no more veri.. Mr. Speaker? Representative McGrew?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McGrew is in the front of the room."

Bullock: "Representative Breslin?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Breslin. How is Representative Breslin recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Breslin in the room? Take her off the record."

Bullock: "Representative Wolf?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Wolf? How is..."

Bullock: "J.J. Wolf?"





Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Wolf. How is Representative J.J. Wolf recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative J.J. Wolf in the room? Take him off the record."

Bullock: "Representative Reed."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Reed is in her chair."

Bullock: "Representative John Hallock?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hallock. How is Representative Hallock recorded?"

Bullock: "Representative..."

Speaker Giorgi: "He's in the middle of the aisle."

Bullock: "Representative Winchester."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Winchester. He's in the back of the room."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, could you give me the Affirmative vote at this point?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Sure. What's the Affirmative votes? Mr. Clerk? There are now 85 affirmative votes."

Bullock: "Alright, Repres..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Preston, for what reason do you arise?"

Preston: "Mr. Speaker, tell me how I am recorded?"

Speaker Giorgi: "How is Representative Preston recorded?"

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

Preston: "Would you please record me as voting 'no'?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Change it. Representative Dawson wants to be recorded as voting 'no'. Dawson. What's the..."

Clerk O'Brien: "'Aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "What's the count now? Margalus is back on the Roll Call. On this question there are 84 'ayes' and 40 'nos'. And this Bill, having received the.. failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. 84 'ayes'. Representative Matijeich for an announcement on Appropriations Committee."



Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave, the Minority and Leader and I have kissed and made up after yesterday. I'd like to have leave and use the Attendance Roll Call so that Senate Bill 1588, we could suspend the Posting Rule. This is the Secretary of State's appropriation Bill and it wasn't posted. He called us after posting. He can attend next week's meeting but not the following week. So I'd like to have leave and use the Attendance Roll Call for that purpose."

Speaker Giorgi: "What Senate Bill number was that again, Mr. Matijevich?"

Matijevich: "1588."

Speaker Giorgi: "1788?"

Matijevich: "1588."

Speaker Giorgi: "Senate Bill 1588, does the Gentleman have leave? There being no objections, leave is.. Representative Ryan, for what reason do you arise?"

Ryan: "Well, I object, Mr. Speaker. We didn't kiss and make up. But we did agree that he could do this."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay. But let the record show that that didn't happen. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "And also leave to discharge Appropriations I Committee on House Bill 3350. We've also talked about that. And, that went to Rules Committee. We inadvertently had heard the Bill and we have to put it back on track. Could I have leave for that purpose?"

Speaker Giorgi: "The Clerk will read your motion, so the record is clear."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pursuant to Rule 66-A, I move that to discharge Committee on Appropriations I from further consideration of House Bill 3350, suspend Rule 66-B relating to Calendar requirement and Rule 25-E relating to Committee deadline and advance to the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no obj... Representative Madigan,



for what reason do you arise? There being no objection, we'll use the Attendance Roll Call and okay, permission is granted. Now we're going to put the t.v. lights on for a few moments. House Bill 3207. House Bill 3207."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3207, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to natural resources, research, data collection, and environmental studies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill would establish in the Institute of Natural Resources a person who will have the responsibility of serving as a clearing house in order to help small businesses get the contracts of the Minority... of the Institute of Natural Resources. That person would be the focus of trying to help Minority businesses also, secure some of the contracts. And I ask for the approval of this matter."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no one standing in opposition, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3207 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 50 'ayes' and 48 'nays', two voting 'present'. And this Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 3358."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3358, a Bill for an Act to provide for loans to certain corporations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "House Bill 3358, Representative Dawson."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Committee, (sic), we had this Bill yesterday. We don't want to see the same Roll Call. I'd like to try to pick up a few more votes. We know it's a direct loan to private industry. We've had the Amendments to try to make this



Bill palatable to everybody and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Skinner stands in opposition. Representative Skinner?"

Skinner: "Barely, Mr. Speaker. This Bill keeps coming back like a bad penny. It is not the Wisconsin steel Bill anymore though because Wisconsin steel wouldn't qualify for a dime of loan under the provisions of this Bill because Wisconsin steel has no unencumbered assets. And that means we're putting forth a new proposal which will allow large business in the future to come to the State of Illinois to get money, assuming the Governor is dumb enough to give it to them. And I don't think we ought to give the Governor that .. that responsibility."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Collins to close."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm not going to belabor the point. I just want to impress upon the House once more we're talking about 3400 people who are willing to work and they're out of jobs. We're talking about a company with a record, a strike free record, that has been brought to its knees by the strike of another company. We're talking about a company that can be viable. We're talking about a company that produces a product that is saleable and for which a market is waiting. They need help from us. I think it's an investment in the economy of the State of Illinois and I would ask for your favorable Consideration."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, ... Representative Dawson, do you want to close?"

Dawson: "Well, all I can say is we had the Chrysler Bill. we gave people <sup>the</sup> beer money today. Now we need some for Wisconsin steel."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3385 pass?'"



All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 69 'aye', 65 'nay', and five voting 'present'. And this Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Representative Taylor, for what reason do you arise? "

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of an announcement. We have here a group of students from Marshal High School. They're in the gallery to the rear here. They are from the 21st District represented by Representative Henry, Representative Patrick and Representative Molloy."

Speaker Giorgi: "House Bill 3421. Representative Hoffman on House Bill 3421. "

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3421, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Housing Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hoffman in place of Representative Daniels on House Bill 3421."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3421 was discussed I believe yesterday. It provides for the change in the Illinois Housing Development Authority to issue bonds for the construction of single family dwellings. The genesis of this Bill of course comes from the depressed condition of the construction market today. The purpose of this is hopefully to expand jobs and opportunities in that particular market and I would encourage an affirmative vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no one standing in opposition, the question is.... Representative Bradley?"

Bradley: "I'm wondering whether the Chief House Sponsor.. I don't see a hyphenated Sponsor on this."



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Daniels filed a letter with the Clerk giving Mr. Hoffman permission to handle the Bill. I don't know what the rules are."

Bradley: "Well, I suggest we check our rules and see if you can do that."

Speaker Giorgi: "Does anyone know what the rule is? Representative Kane on the Bill in the meantime."

Kane: "I was going to raise the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the Gentleman isn't interested enough to hear his Bill, and stay here I think we ought to just not hear it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Time out. Why don't we skip over this Bill for a moment while the Parliamentarian looks it up and go to the next Bill then? Just a moment. One moment, Representative Hoffman. Just a moment. Representative Hoffman, for what reason do you arise?"

Hoffman: "I am somewhat shocked by the questions which are raised that I am not an acceptable surrogate for Representative Daniels."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. ... Representative Hoffman, in House Rule 37-B, if such a request is made or the Sponsor is absent, the Speaker shall order that the consideration of the Bill or Resolution be deferred. According to the rule, it should come out of the record. According to the rule it comes out of the record if there's objections. Next Bill, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Greiman. Is Representative Greiman in the room? That's House Bill 3465. Out of the record. Representative Redmond, or Farley on House Bill 3514? House Bill 3514. They're both here."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3514, a Bill for an Act creating the Advisory Board to the Industrial Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Farley on House Bill 3514."



Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House! This Bill was discussed the other day and what it does it create an Advisory Board of nine Members appointed by the Governor with the approval of the Senate to study the Workmen's Compensation problems that some of us have.."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Farley. Representative Simms, for what reason do you arise? Representative Ryan requests the..."

Simms: "Representative Farley done?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Not yet."

Simms: "Oh, I'm sorry. When he gets through I want to be recognized."

Speaker Giorgi: "Well, Representative Ryan was very adamant. Representative Farley continue."

Farley: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I stated this Bill is an attempt to establish an Advisory Commission to study the Workmen's Compensation Act and advise us on any needed changes. I don't..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Representative Farley. Representative Simms, again, for what reason do you arise?"

Simms: "A point of order. Representative Daniels was... Representative Hoffman was just denied the right to handle Representative Daniels' Bill..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Redmond's here..."

Simms: "And Mr. Speaker... Well, let him handle his own Bill."

Farley: "Mr. Speaker? I can clear that up. I am a hyphenated Cosponsor of the Bill. It's on file with the Clerk."

Simms: "Well, I thought maybe since the Speaker put out a press release, how interested he was in small business, that he'd want to handle the Bill himself so we could be privileged to hear his...."

Farley: "Can I proceed, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Farley continue. Representative Farley continue."



Farley: "Again, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a nine Member Advisory Commission to study the problem of Workmen's Compensation. I think that because of our actions yesterday with Representative Lechowicz's Bill which was the agreed Bill on Unemployment Insurance, that this is a step forward to provide us with some input from an Advisory Commission for Workmen's Compensation. And I see nothing wrong with it and I certainly hope that every Member would support this measure."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Simms in opposition."

Simms: "Well, Represe... Mr. Speaker, Representatives of the House, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in opposition to this Bill because very simply we're just duplicating what's already there. There already exists two Advisory Committees who could easily provide the same functions advising the Industrial Commission. There's a Joint Employee-Employer Advisory Council or the Agreed Committee and the General Assembly Labor, Laws Commission. It's being duplicative. We're spending more of the taxpayers money for bureacracy. And the second reason, after reading Representative Redmond's press release saying well, these Bills were defeated, I don't think we'd want to pass this Bill so his press release would not be accurate. For these reasons, I would ask that the Bill be defeated."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Farley to close."

Farley: "I would just appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3514 pass?' All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? What was that, Mr. Simms? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 81 'ayes', 45 'nays', and four voting 'present'. And this Bill, having failed to





receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 3539."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3539, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Housing Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel?"

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We have discussed this Bill to quite great lengths in the past. I have just a couple of things I would like to mention. One, Representative Kane had objections in reference to the Bill did not state that it was low and moderate income housing. Even though it wasn't in the statutes, I talked to Representative Kane earlier today. Assured him at the present time we're having an Amendment taken.. or drawn up. If it goes over to the Senate, I will add that to clarify the situation. And, I have no objections to the Amendment that was added. The Amendment deals with federal funds, does not deal with state funds. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition?" Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've gone through this Bill on a number of occasions. Even though the Amendment that the Sponsor says that he will add in the Senate improves the Bill, I think that it is still a bad Bill and it's still leading the Housing Development Authority in a direction that it should not be going. And I'd urge a 'no' vote."

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 Henry? Have all voted who wish? Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, as you know, I've risen in opposition to these Bills in the past. Representative Piel did discuss this Bill with us. We did add what I think were very sub-



stantive Amendments and I think the Bill is now in the form that it could be further refined in the Senate and for the reasons given earlier that Representative Piel will work to put a constructive Amendment on this Bill, I rise in support of it and certainly would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also would like to rise in support of Mr. Piel's excellent Bill. It is now in the posture where it puts IHDA in the posture that it should have been in statutorily and that is, providing secondary mortgages for single family homes in the medium income range. The Amendment that I put in would create housing in the Section 8 subsidy range. It's a good Bill and give us a couple of more green votes please."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Henry."

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Representative that is sponsoring this Bill has been working the last three weeks that I know of. There were some objections to his Bill, but he was legitimate enough to sit down and try to compromise and put the Bill in shape. Sure, there is some room for improvement in this Bill, but I have to compliment the Representative Piel for his actions, his understanding and his agreement and I am supporting this Bill and I hope we pass it out of the House."

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

Kane: "We're only trying to convince people that aren't here and since I will verify this, there's no point in putting the 89th vote on."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 88 'aye' and 31 'no'. Representative Piel requests a poll of the absentees." Representative Piel? John Vitek? Representative Vitek, 'aye'. It's pretty obvious that ... You persist in



your request for a poll of the absentees? No. Representative Cullerton, 'aye'. How many do you have there now? Request for a poll of the absentees has been withdrawn. Representative Kane? Representative Kane, you requesting a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call? It's pretty obvious that we should dump this Roll Call and do it over again. Dump the Roll Call. Please only your own switch. You're not doing anything except delaying. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Please only your own. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Let's dump it again. I see names on here that are not sitting in their seats and it's silly to vote other switches when we know there's going to be a verification. Dump the Roll Call. Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Your switch only. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 85 'aye' and 20 'no'. Representative Piel."

Piel: "I hate to do it, but we're close. And I know there's a lot of people sitting over in their offices."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, if that's what you desire.

Representative Piel desires a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Abramson. Beatty. Birchler. Bluthardt. Borchers. Bowman. Breslin. Capuzi. Casey. Catania. Christensen. Daniels. Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewell. Garmisa. Getty. Greiman. Griesheimer. Hanahan..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Let it fail, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "What was that, 'Sir?'" He withdraws his request for a poll of the absentees. On this question there's 85 'aye' and 20 'no'. This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. 3565? "

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3565, a Bill for an Act relating to the filling of vacancies in certain state offices. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "We're just wasting time on it. We should just table that Bill or whatever is necessary."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman have leave to table? Hearing no objections, leave... table is granted. On the Order of Motions, appears House Resolution 784. Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask for leave of the House to take motion and the motion with respect to House Resolution 787 together."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Will you read 787, Mr. Clerk? Got the Bill... er, the Resolution? Mr. Johnson."  
 O: Yeah, we're on motions. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "What is the vote requirement for these to be passed, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Why don't you hear what Representative Johnson intends to do and then we'll make that decision? Representative Bowman. Woods rather."

Bowman: "Yes, I just returned to the floor and I'd like to inquire as to whether the matter is properly before us. Now we have to bypass Committee, and to bring it to the floor? Aren't Resolutions normally referred to Committee?"

Speaker Redmond: "Motion is to place it on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration."

Bowman: "Okay. So then it is a motion to bypass Committee,



right?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct."

Bowman: "Well, what is the requisite number of votes for that motion to be adopted?"

Speaker Redmond: "107."

Bowman: "107. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson had, I understand, leave to amend the Bill or the Resolution. Is that correct? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, wait a minute. How can we amend this if it isn't in front of us? We can't amend..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay..."

Bowman: "We can't amend something that isn't on the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. It takes 107 votes. Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, I defer to Representative Collins to lead off on these and then I'll conclude."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On the motion, there were a number of Resolutions, four in number, offered on this subject which as we know has been quite inflammatory. We would like to avoid anything that would inflame any partisan or insert any position on the issue that was involved or surrounding these motions. So, as a result, we and when I say we, I mean Representative Johnson and I met with the Speaker and agreed that we would not persist in the other Resolutions and would only at this time persist in the motion involving House Resolution 784 and 787. These are the two Resolutions calling upon the proper authorities to look into the allegations that were made surrounding the circumstances of last week. It's our understanding that these things are already being done and it was our further thought though, that it would be proper for



this Body to express the desire of the Body that these matters do be looked into. So, as a result, the two Resolutions, one calling on the State's Attorney of Sangamon County and one calling upon the United States Attorney, are the two Resolutions for which we are placing the motions. We are quite content not to persist in the others and that is... those are the two Resolutions that we're asking that... in this motion that we bypass Committee and place before the House for immediate consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "It's the intention that if the motions prevail that the Resolutions will be amended. Is that correct?"

Collins: "That is correct, Mr. Speaker. And that was.. that was further understood by I understand you, Representative Johnson and I and the Amendment is prepared in the likelihood that the motion prevails."

Speaker Redmond: "Probably on your desk, Representative Bowman. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to speak against the motion to bypass the Committee. I can well understand the desire of the Sponsors of the Resolutions to amend them to tone down the language. I think the Resolutions should not have been introduced in the first place and if they were introduced they should have been prepared with careful thought and not prepared hastily. Nevertheless, we do have a Committee system. And the Bill... or the Resolution isn't even in the Committee. This is not a motion to discharge. It's a motion to bypass. I see no urgency. I see no reason why these Amendments to the Resolution could not be offered in Committee and taken up in the proper course of business. As the Representative from the other side of the aisle pointed out, investigations are in progress at the present time.



I see no reason why we need to be hasty about this and by pass Committee and offer.. and bring up these Amendments and debate it at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Kane: "Either one. Will either of these Resolutions add to or subtract from anything that either the State's Attorney of Sangamon County or the District Attorney is now doing or will do?"

Johnson: "Let me. I can speak to that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "A; I have spoken as have others to both prosecutorial authorities and they have indicated that they think this is helpful. B; It's certainly an indication of House intent to look to potential problems within the House. Both of them feel that it would be helpful in the overall process to have House approbation of these particular proceedings."

Kane: "Helpful in what way?"

Johnson: "Helpful in terms of expressing House intent to get at the potential problem..."

Kane: "Will it add to... "

Johnson: "Certainly not, as you know, Representative Kane, a House Resolution is not the same as a House Bill. So it certainly doesn't have the force of law. It does have the force of intent and I think of this grave magnitude, it's important to have that expression of intent before the people of Illinois and also before those respective prosecutorial authorities."

Kane: "Is there anything that either the State's Attorney of Sangamon County or the District Attorney will not do in the pursuit of their investigation if these Resolutions are not passed?"

Johnson: "You'd have to ask them that question, Representative



Kane. They've both indicated they are in favor of these Resolutions. They think it would helpful in the processes we're undergoing."

Kane: "Helpful in what way?"

Johnson: "Helpful.. I think I've an.. asked and answered two or three times."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Member of the House, I think one of the encouraging things about this whole matter was, I don't think anybody has ever suggested any Member of this House took any money in connection with these charges. But I think also, I think this is a further step to.. on our part, to see that the proper action is taken if there is any real evidence of wrongdoing and I think that I personally would prefer that we handle it. It was ruled otherwise, but at least we're expressing our cooperation with those who do intend to look into it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think Representative Collins in his initial remarks said we are trying to create a situation where we divorce ourself from the real issue. And I don't know how you can do that. If the purpose of the Resolutions were to ask for an investigation because of certain allegations, then they would be meritorius but everybody here knows that investigations are being conducted right now by both of these investigative agencies. At least, from all that I hear. So, what would be the purpose of this? What would happen is that there would be more headlines about the House calling for investigations and some inflamatory language as I understand in the Preamble. But that doesn't bother me. But what does bother me is that you can't divorce the issue because of the emotion of the real issue. I feel





that the matter of the Equal Rights Amendment goes toward the equality of rights under the law. It goes to me at the heart of justice. If we believe in justice, we believe that the investigative agencies which are now investigating do their jobs. Let's do our job and legislate, without any of the side issues, without any inflammatory.. without going toward this Resolution that has no purpose now, no purpose at all. And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to vote 'present' on this issue because it's actually says nothing. It means nothing. I don't know how any investigator, any prosecutor can tell you that he needs this, he needs this to investigate. I can't understand that. Because a prosecutor does his job. The investigative agency does their job. They don't even need our direction. You know that. Do they need this legislative Body to tell them when they have to investigate? Everybody here says 'no'. So, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, let them do their job, but don't let us do anything that's going to take away from the real issue, the issue of equal rights under the law. That's what concerns me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cullerton. Van Duyne?"

Van Duyne: "I just want to move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Who are you pointing to, Representative Steele? Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In many ways I agree with Representative Matijevich. I know that this may not create the kind of feeling that we want it to. But I think the damage has already been done as far as the press is concerned. I don't know how the rest of you feel. I'm sure you feel as I do. I have a great respect for where I am. I want more people out there to have that same respect for all of us. I know that none of us, I believe sincerely in my heart, that not one of us has done any--"



thing wrong . I think the benefit is in openness and the House saying, 'Go ahead'. Or encouraging, rather than go ahead and do it. I don't see any loss by this Resolution, but I do honestly see a benefit. And I would respectfully ask that you consider that. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question, for a second time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Dwyne has moved the previous question. Seconded by Representative Bullock. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, what's at stake here is not the question of the issue of last week, and what's at stake here is not a question of the effect of this Resolution. Representative Matijevich said that the passage of House Resolution 784 and 787 mean nothing. Well, if it means nothing, to say to the people of Illinois and to say to our colleagues here that we want to clean up the... look to the issue, the dignity of this House, if it means nothing to indicate that we think the proper source from which real effort can be made to restore that dignity ought to be the House itself, and if it means nothing to ask in a Resolution that proper prosecutorial authorities from the source of this House itself look into serious allegations, and we don't know where those allegations will lead. We don't know what side of the issue they're going to lead to. But I think it's sufficient to say that to date, there have been those allegations and at least in many people's mind on a widespread enough basis, that we've got an obligation as Members of this House, as Leaders



of the State of Illinois to stand tall and to say, this is the sort of thing we've got an obligation to do. And if we don't do it, and if it means nothing, then the people of Illinois have got a very real reason to say the House and the Legislature and people in government somehow stand above the law. We don't. We shouldn't and nobody in this House ought to feel that the passage of this Resolution is intended to do anything but to restore the dignity of this House of Representatives and also to show that the proper source of a clean up, the proper source of a close examination is the source of the potential allegations themselves. I think this is a realistic Resolution. It's something that's moderate. The prosecutorial authorities have indicated this is helpful to them and I think that all the people of Illinois, people in government everywhere, this is something that ought to be done for the sake of us all. I urge your support of these two House Resolutions to bring before us on immediate consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to suspend the rule in order that House Resolution 784 and 787 may be placed on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration. Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Requires 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 81 'aye' and 6 'no' and the motion fails. Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. Last week.... Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Cameras off. State your point."

Johnson: "Last week on Thursday when Representative Collins, Hanahan, Birkinbine and I, et. al. introduced these Resolutions, you indicated to us Mr. Speaker that you felt that in at least using the analogy of Rule 80, that there



ought to be a five day lapse. And we went along with that because we believed that the ruling of the Chair and the bipartisan approach to this problem is something we should have. We asked you on Monday, and Tuesday, and Wednesday and Thursday when you intended to call these Resolutions, Mr. Speaker. And you indicated to us each day that you would call them this week. You indicated to us yesterday, Representative Collins and I, both, that you would call them at a time when it was opportune and optimal with respect to the attendance of this House. We sat here all day and asked on a half an hour and an hourly basis when these Resolutions were going to be called. And look around and see what you have now. You don't have 107 people in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. And you knew when you called this Resolution and apparently when you indicated to us that you would call it at an optimal time, that that was going to be the case, Mr. Speaker. We played the rules according to your game. We played it according to the direction of the Chair and here's what we get in return. I don't know what you have to hide, Mr. Speaker. I don't know what your side of the aisle has to hide, but there's something wrong when you break your commitment to us as you have done in this case and we won't forget it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson, I'm going to depart from the usual decorum of the Chair. But, I certainly resent the suggesting that I have anything to hide. When you have been in public office as long as I have been, if you're reputation is as good as mine, you can be very thankful. Now... Is there anything appearing on the Calendar that people want called? Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House... Senate Joint Resolution 90, DiPrima, Senate Joint Resolution 105, Satterthwaithe, House Resolution 805, Gaines, 806, Birchler, 808, Hanahan,



809, VonBoeckman, 811, Catania, 812, Davis.. or Daniels maybe."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer?"

Brummer: "Mr. Speaker, was 3019 the airport Bill ever called? Representative Flinn has some interest in having that called."

Speaker Redmond: "I think he misplaced it yesterday. "

Brummer: "It was not called?"

Speaker Redmond: "Or at least the nine dollars."

Brummer: "He would like to come back later this evening and talk about it. Could we get permission of the Doorkeeper to allow him into the chamber tonight?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi on the Agreed Resolutions."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 90 by DiPrima memorializes Congress to do something about veterans' benefits. Satterthwaite's Senate Joint Resolution 105 honors Mr. Robert DeVito, Director of the Department of Mental Health. 805 by Gaines asks for an exchange of information from the people of Nigeria. 806 by Birchler tells about a School District celebrating its 50th anniversary. 808 by Hanahan notes Lawrence L. Gilbert, 30 years of outstanding contribution to education. And VonBoeckman's 809 heralds the greatness of Bill O'Connel, of Peoria Journal-Star, one of my few.. very few journalistic friends. And 811 by Catania congratulates the <sup>Kemper</sup> 'Insurance Company'. And 812 by Dawson records a stone memorial to ~~tomorrow~~.... I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Then you have two Death Resolutions." I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the <sup>agreed</sup> Resolution<sup>s</sup>. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted."



Giorgi: "There are two Death Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Death Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 807, Ryan-McBroom, with respect to the memory of Mr. Raymond 'Azzere[[f]]' and House Resolution 810, Cullerton-Neff, with respect to the memory of Mrs. Francis W. 'Heikenogle'."

Giorgi: "I move for the adoption of the Death Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Death Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. The Death Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 787, Collins, 784, Johnson, 783 Johnson, 789, Johnson, 793 Mautino. 797, Leinenweber. House Joint Resolution 102, Mautino."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignments." "Request for vote changes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Beatty requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 1215. Are there any objections? Representative Ropp requests to vote 'no' and Winchester 'aye' on House Bill 2131. Are there any objections? Representative Watson requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2846. Is there any objection? Representative Ropp requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 2868. Is there any objection? Representative Swanstrom requests to vote 'aye' on House Bills 3005 and 3017. Are there any objections? Representative Dave Jones requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3166, 3167? Is there any objection? Representative VonBoeckman and Beatty request to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3377. Is there any objection? Representative Preston requests to vote 'aye' on House 3465. Is there any objection? Representative Johnson requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3594. Is there any objection? Representative Hoffman requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 3600. Is there any objection?"



Speaker Redmond: "Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Kane and Richard Mugalian from the Committee on State Government and Organization report the following Committee Bill for introduction; House Bill 3614, action taken May 13th, 1980."

Speaker Redmond: "Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3614, Committee on State Government and Organization, a Bill for an Act creating a Department of Nuclear Safety. First Reading of the Bill. "

Speaker Redmond: "Message from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien : "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that 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 #104, Resolved by the Senate of the Eighty-First General Assembly, the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, when the Senate adjourns on Friday, May 23rd, 1980 it stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 27th, 1980 at 4:00 o'clock p.m. and when the House of Representatives adjourns on Friday, May 23rd, 1980, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, May 27th, 1980 at 12:00 o'clock noon."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adjournment Resolution."

Madigan: "I move for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 104."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the motion. Any discussion? The question's on the motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. The Resolution's adopted. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Providing three minutes for a Perfunctory Session, I move that we adjourn till Tuesday at 12:00 noon."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the motion. Those in favor



say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. The House stands adjourned till Tuesday, 12:00 noon."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 1500, Slape, a Bill for an Act in relation to the sale of motor fuel at retail. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1559, Emil Jones, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1606, Matijevich, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1678, Rigney, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1827, Bullock... Senate Bill 1884, Peters... a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning diseases. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1933, Ewing, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1827, Bullock, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. No further business. No further business. The House now stands adjourned."





## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
MAY 23, 1980

PAGE 1

HB-0536	3RD READING	PAGE	128
HB-0697	3RD READING	PAGE	46
HB-1848	MOTIONS	PAGE	59
HB-2051	3RD READING	PAGE	143
HB-2131	3RD READING	PAGE	97
HB-2220	3RD READING	PAGE	108
HB-2705	MOTIONS	PAGE	97
HB-2822	3RD READING	PAGE	101
HB-2837	3RD READING	PAGE	125
HB-2846	3RD READING	PAGE	156
HB-2858	3RD READING	PAGE	110
HB-2861	TABLED	PAGE	97
HB-3118	TABLED	PAGE	97
HB-3160	3RD READING	PAGE	28
HB-3166	3RD READING	PAGE	64
	MOTIONS	PAGE	60
HB-3167	3RD READING	PAGE	60
HB-3200	3RD READING	PAGE	159
HB-3207	3RD READING	PAGE	171
HB-3288	MOTIONS	PAGE	96
HB-3350	MOTIONS	PAGE	170
HB-3358	3RD READING	PAGE	171
HB-3377	3RD READING	PAGE	9
HB-3430	MOTIONS	PAGE	38
HB-3487	3RD READING	PAGE	64
HB-3488	3RD READING	PAGE	39
HB-3490	3RD READING	PAGE	40
HB-3513	MOTIONS	PAGE	38
HB-3514	3RD READING	PAGE	174
HB-3539	3RD READING	PAGE	177
HB-3555	3RD READING	PAGE	65
HB-3565	TABLED	PAGE	180
HB-3580	3RD READING	PAGE	114
HB-3594	3RD READING	PAGE	74
HB-3600	3RD READING	PAGE	87
HB-3614	1ST READING	PAGE	191
SB-1457	1ST READING	PAGE	1
SB-1483	1ST READING	PAGE	5
SB-1500	1ST READING	PAGE	192
SB-1559	1ST READING	PAGE	192
SB-1578	1ST READING	PAGE	5
SB-1588	MOTIONS	PAGE	170
SB-1606	1ST READING	PAGE	192

## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
MAY 23, 1980

PAGE 2

SB-1618	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1625	1ST READING	PAGE	1
SB-1626	1ST READING	PAGE	1
SB-1631	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1636	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1637	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1640	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1643	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1662	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1665	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1666	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1678	1ST READING	PAGE	192
SB-1771	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1773	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1810	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1812	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1827	1ST READING	PAGE	192
	1ST READING	PAGE	192
SB-1884	1ST READING	PAGE	192
SB-1893	1ST READING	PAGE	5
SB-1933	1ST READING	PAGE	192
SB-1946	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1957	1ST READING	PAGE	2
SB-1991	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1992	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1993	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1994	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-1995	1ST READING	PAGE	3
SB-2000	1ST READING	PAGE	3
HR-0279	TABLED	PAGE	7
HR-0783	1ST READING	PAGE	190
HR-0784	1ST READING	PAGE	190
	MOTIONS	PAGE	180
HR-0787	1ST READING	PAGE	190
	MOTIONS	PAGE	180
HR-0789	1ST READING	PAGE	190
HR-0793	1ST READING	PAGE	190
HR-0797	1ST READING	PAGE	190
HJR-0042	TABLED	PAGE	6
HJR-0092	3RD READING	PAGE	9
HJR-0102	1ST READING	PAGE	190
HJR-0104	3RD READING	PAGE	191

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
MAY 23, 1980

PAGE 3

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND-HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. KREUGER-PRAYER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
VOTES CHANGES	PAGE	3
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	5
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	6
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	189
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	190
REPRESTATIVES CHANGE VOTING RECORDS	PAGE	190
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	191
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	192
HOUSE STANDS ADJOURNED	PAGE	192