

1 Doorkeeper: "Attention Members of the House of Representatives. The 12  
 2 House will convene in 15 minutes. Attention Members of the 13  
 3 House of Representatives. The House will convene in 5 minutes. 14  
 4 Persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the 15  
 5 gallery." 16

6 Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. Members please be in 17  
 7 their seats. Be led in prayer by the regular chaplain, Father 18  
 8 Krueger." 19

9 Father Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy 20  
 10 Ghost, Amen. Lord bless this House to Thy service this day, 21  
 11 Amen. Thomas Alva Edison said, be it all things we are capable 22  
 12 of doing, we'd literally astound ourselves. Let us pray. All 23  
 13 mighty God our heavenly Father we praise Thee this day for our 24  
 14 life, our health, our family and friends. Above all do we 25  
 15 praise Thee for the inestimable value of our freedom and 26  
 16 democratic way of government and society. We praise Thee for 27  
 17 our having the privilege, we praise Thee for our having been 28  
 18 privileged to serve in this Illinois House of Representatives 29  
 19 and to share in the never ending process of making this a 30  
 20 better community in which to dwell. Enrich our minds, instill 31  
 21 our spirits and nourish our courage, that we never speak out 32  
 22 for that which is right and constantly search for that which is 33  
 23 more desirable. That we may effect a government for the people 34  
 24 of the State of Illinois which brings joy and happiness, 35  
 25 security and comfort for all who dwell therein. This we ask in 36  
 26 the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen." 37

27 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins. The Pledge of Allegiance." 38

28 Collins: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of 39  
 29 America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation 40  
 30 under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." 41

31 Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Your switch only. Take 42  
 32 the record. What have you got? We'll put Brummer on the Roll 43  
 33 Call. That's 89. On the order of nonconcurrence Senate Bill 44  
 34 185, on page 12. Representative Davis. You want to nonconcur? 45  
 35 It's whether we recede or don't recede, I guess." 46

36 Davis: "Yeah I guess it is, but I can't find it. I didn't even know 47

1 it was on the Calendar, Mr. Speaker. Let's take it out of the 48  
2 record and let me talk to the Senate Sponsor." 50  
3 Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. Representative Davis." 52  
4 Davis: "On the order of concurrence Speaker, I have House Bill 987 53  
5 I'd like to move to nonconcurrence." 55  
6 Speaker Redmond: "Okay. 97 you say?" 57  
7 Collins: "987 Sir." 59  
8 Speaker Redmond: "That's on page 9. House Bill 987. Representative 60  
9 Davis." 61  
10 Davis: "Yes Sir, I'd like to move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment 62  
11 #1." 63  
12 Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur in Senate 64  
13 Amendment #1 to House Bill 987. Those in favor of the motion 65  
14 indicate by saying 'aye' 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have 66  
15 it. The motion carried. The House nonconcur. Former House 67  
16 Member, now Senator Geo-Karis is visiting the scene of her 68  
17 former triumphs. Anyone else on a nonconcurrence. Anything 69  
18 appearing on concurrence that they desire to nonconcur? Motion 70  
19 to adjourn sine die. Representative Campbell for what purpose 71  
20 do you rise?" 72  
21 Campbell: "I move we adjourn sine die." 74  
22 Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those 75  
23 in favor say 'aye', oppose 'no'. You heard the motion. 76  
24 Goodbye Governor. Representative Reilly." 78  
25 Reilly: "On the Order of Non-concurrence, Senate Bill 418. I would 79  
26 like to move to refuse to recede and ask for the appointment of 80  
27 a Conference Committee." 81  
28 Speaker Redmond: "What page is that on?" 83  
29 Reilly: "12." 85  
30 Speaker Redmond: "On page 12, 418. Representative Reilly moves that 86  
31 the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 87  
32 418. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' 88  
33 have it, the motion carries. Representative Brummer." 90  
34 Brummer: "Yes, on page 7, House Bill 318. You're looking for items 91  
35 of concurrence." 92  
36 Speaker Redmond: "Page 7, 318." 94

1 Brummer: "I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. The Bill 95  
 2 originally extended the period of time in which whole companies 96  
 3 could enter into coal leases on estates of miner's or 97  
 4 incompetence. The Bill as it went to the Senate, extended 98  
 5 that time from 10 to 25 years. The Senate Amendment #1, rolls 99  
 6 that period back from 25 years as we sent it over there, to 15  
 7 years. And I would move to concur." 101

8 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners. Question is on the 102  
 9 Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1. 103  
 10 Those in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Final action. He 104  
 11 did not, no. I think that kind of goes with his motion. Have 105  
 12 all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this 106  
 13 question there's 95 'ayes' and no 'nay' and the House does 107  
 14 concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 318. In addition  
 15 to Representative Reilly moving to refuse to recede he also 108  
 16 moved that a Conference Committee be recorded. Appointed. On 110  
 17 the Order of Concurrence, 1223. 1223. Representative Epton."

18 Epton: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 112  
 19 This is a Bill which was sent out of this House very proudly. 113  
 20 It's the guarantee fund for life and health insurance 114  
 21 companies. When it was sent over, we initially intended to 115  
 22 include an Amendment correcting some language and specifically 116  
 23 directing the Director of Insurance to notify the Board of 117  
 24 Directors of an insurance carrier, not later than 3 days after  
 25 determination of their insolvency. It also served..." 119

26 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty for what purpose do you rise?" 120

27 Getty: "Well Mr. Speaker, if the Gentleman is moving to concur there 122  
 28 are some Members on my side of the aisle that indicated some 123  
 29 problems...take it out of the record." 125

30 Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. 1094. Page 9. 126  
 31 Representative Campbell." 127

32 Campbell: "Mr. Speaker this was a Department of Conservation Bill 128  
 33 which provided the Department of Conservation may deposit 129  
 34 income received from its operations every Monday if the amount 130  
 35 received exceeds \$500. Previously, they had to deposit in the 131  
 36 various accounts maybe as little as \$5. The Senate Amendment 132

1 provides that in addition to the Department depositing money 133  
 2 from its operations every Monday, it also may deposit money  
 3 from an account 30 days after it's received. And I would move 134  
 4 to concur in Senate Amendment #1." 136

5 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell. You move to concur, is 137  
 6 that correct?" 138

7 Campbell: "That's correct." 140

8 Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative Campbell's motion 141  
 9 to concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1095. Those in 142  
 10 favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Final action. Have all 143  
 11 voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take... 144  
 12 The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 80 145  
 13 90 'aye' and no 'nay' and the House does concur in Senate 146  
 14 Amendment #1. 1459 on page 11. Representative Friedland." 147

15 Friedland: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 148  
 16 House. Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1459, restored the 149  
 17 distance of 300 feet in the definition of a residents district. 150  
 18 And the Amendment was supported by DOT, the Municipal League 151  
 19 and the Superintendent's of Highways and I urge that we concur 152  
 20 in this Amendment." 153

21 Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Kane." 155

22 Kane: "This Amendment effectively negates the House Amendment. I 156  
 23 don't think this Amendment is printed yet, Mr. Speaker." 158

24 Speaker Redmond: "Have they been printed? No they have not. I'll 159  
 25 have to take it out of the record." 161

26 Kane: "Mr. Speaker." 163

27 Speaker Redmond: "Yeah." 165

28 Kane: "What are the rules concerning how long a Senate Amendment has 166  
 29 to be on our desk for concurrence?" 168

30 Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian. 3 hours. The length of time an 169  
 31 Amendment has to be on our desk before it's called. 3 hours." 170

32 Kane: "If at all possible, since we're way ahead of time this year, 172  
 33 if we could slow down a little bit because some of these 173  
 34 Amendments coming over from the Senate change these Bills 174  
 35 rather radically and very few of us have a chance to even look 175  
 36 at them." 176

1	Speaker Redmond: "What is the solution, Mr. Kane."	178
2	Kane: "Well if we could ah hold the concurrence on the Calendar for a	179
3	day, it might help."	181
4	Speaker Redmond: "Then what order do we go to? Order of part 3, I	182
5	think. 1088. On page 9. Representative Ryan."	184
6	Ryan: "Mr. Speaker could you give us a schedule for the remainder of	185
7	the day. What you intentions are and how long we're going to	186
8	be in..."	187
9	Speaker Redmond: "I would say 10:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. 9:00 p.m."	189
10	Ryan: "I can read that Mr. Speaker, but I want to know what your	190
11	intentions are with the actions of the House. How long we're	191
12	going to be in..."	192
13	Speaker Redmond: "9:00 o'clock."	194
14	Ryan: "Straight through from now to 9:00?"	196
15	Speaker Redmond: "That's correct."	198
16	Ryan: "No break?"	200
17	Speaker Redmond: "No break. That's my intentions."	202
18	Ryan: "Oh is that what you're going to do?"	204
19	Speaker Redmond: "I don't know, how do I know what I'm going to do.	205
20	You go out and get your Republican Members and Representative	206
21	Madigan go out and get his Democratic Members and have every	207
22	Member ready to proceed with his Bill when it's called and I	208
23	can tell you specifically what I'm going to do. But in the	209
24	absence of full attendance and the will to proceed on the	210
25	Membership why it's pretty difficult. As it is now, it looks	211
26	like 9:00 o'clock. And I hope that the lambs and the chickens	211
27	don't spoil. Representative Kempiners."	213
28	Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. On page 9 of concurrence, on page	214
29	9 of the Calendar under concurrences is House Bill 1088. And I	215
30	would move that we do not concur in Senate Amendment #1."	217
31	Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Gentleman's motion that we	218
32	nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1088. Those in	219
33	favor say 'aye' 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.	220
34	Motion carries and the House nonconcur. 969. On page 9.	221
35	Representative Oblinger."	222
36	Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. 969 is the Bill	223

1 that creates the home care in the Department on Aging. Senate 224  
 2 Amendment 2 does four things. Number 1, it answers the 225  
 3 question of 55 or 60, because of the title 20 fund, we have to 226  
 4 have the federal guidelines, so the age limit is now 60. 227  
 5 Number 2, in order to answer the fears of the people who are 228  
 6 handicapped, the Amendment takes care of them under age 60,  
 7 goes to DVR. Because it is now in two departments the nine 229  
 8 million dollars goes to Aging and three million goes to DVR. 230  
 9 And the fourth change is in the transition. The transition 231  
 10 period is to be from July 1st, 79, to January 1st, 1980 and as 232  
 11 the cases are transferred they will be reviewed for  
 12 eligibility. The department's of DVR and Aging will work on 233  
 13 common eligibility rules and will make a common joint report to 234  
 14 this General Assembly in September of each year. I move 235  
 15 concurrence with Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 969." 236

16 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane." 238

17 Kane: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?" 240

18 Speaker Redmond: "She will." 242

19 Kane: "What is the purpose again, of shifting particular services 243  
 20 from the Department of Aging to DVR?" 245

21 Oblinger: "Not from the Department on Aging. From the Department of 246  
 22 Public Aid. Those who are handicapped under 60, will be taken 247  
 23 care of by DVR. All the people over 60 that require care, will 248  
 24 be taken care of by the Department on Aging." 250

25 Kane: "And how was it on the Bill as it went out of here?" 252

26 Oblinger: "The way it went out of here, all the senior citizens would 253  
 27 have been transferred to Aging and the handicapped would have 254  
 28 been left in Public Aid." 255

29 Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Kane. Question 256  
 30 is on the Lady's motion that the House concur in Senate 257  
 31 Amendment 2 to House Bill 969. Those in favor vote 'aye', 258  
 32 oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who 259  
 33 wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 260  
 34 124 'aye' and no 'nay'. And the House does concur in Senate 261  
 35 Amendment 2 to House Bill 969. 724, page '8'. Representative  
 36 Frederick." 262

1 Frederick: "Mr. Chairman...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of 263  
2 the House. I move nonconcurrency with Senate Bill Amendment #1 264  
3 to House Bill 724." 265

4 Speaker Redmond: "Questions on the Lady's motion that the House 266  
5 nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1. Those in favor say 'aye' 267  
6 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. 268  
7 The House does not concur in Senate Amendment 1. House Bill 269  
8 722. Representative Leinenweber, for what purpose do you 270  
9 rise?" 271

10 Leinenweber: "I wonder if the Members when they do move to not 272  
11 concur, whether or not they might give us, say a one sentence 273  
12 explanation to what the Bill did and what the Amendment is and 274  
13 why they are nonconcurring. That would be helpful to the 275  
14 membership." 276

15 Speaker Redmond: "That's a good point. 1541, page 11. 277  
16 Representative Wikoff." 278

17 Wikoff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 279  
18 I would move to concur in Senate Amendment to House Bill 1541. 280  
19 House Bill 1541 is a Bill which authorizes the University of 281  
20 Illinois to basically self-insure. Legalizes what they have 282  
21 been doing since 1977. And this is the Amendment that I agreed 283  
22 on to put on in the Senate when it left here. And it is in 284  
23 agreement with the Auditor General and the Department of  
24 Administrative Services." 285

25 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider." 287

26 Schneider: "Mr. Speaker. Virgil I remember I was opposed to that 288  
27 Bill in Committee. Now did you say that 'Bob Cronston' is in 289  
28 agreement with that or what was that?" 291

29 Wikoff: "Yes, he is in agreement with it and this does have a 292  
30 self-destruct October 1982 ah... places a limit of October 1982 293  
31 at which time the General Assembly may determine if it should 294  
32 be continued or not. Otherwise it's got a self-destruct..." 296

33 Schneider: "What's the ah, what kind of an agreement are we talking 297  
34 about? Do you have the language, I don't have that in front of 298  
35 me, but..." 299

36 Wikoff: "I can give you the synopsis of it. It says basically the 300

1 amount of the reserve shall not exceed the amount necessary. 301  
 2 All earnings shall be considered part of the reserves not used 302  
 3 for any other purposes. It should be used only for purposes of 303  
 4 making payment on civil suits, claims, damages and so on. All 304  
 5 funds must be placed in reserves and if there is an excess, 305  
 6 forms for funding those reserves shall be reduced and it does  
 7 have a repealer act in it." 307

8 Schneider: "Thank you." 309

9 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty." 311

10 Getty: "Virgil I think there's a technical problem with the 312  
 11 Amendment. It provides, Senate Amendment #1 provides that the 313  
 12 entire Section 7a would be repealed on October 1st 1982. Now 314  
 13 the problem with that is, that you'd then be repealing existing 315  
 14 law which requires that the Illinois... University of Illinois 316  
 15 Police Department be provided with public liability insurance.  
 16 I think that would be very dangerous to do that and I don't 317  
 17 really think that was the intent. I think the intent was to 318  
 18 repeal the provisions for self-insurance. And for that reason 319  
 19 I would suggest we nonconcur on this." 321

20 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes." 323

21 E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members 324  
 22 of..." 325

23 Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Schneider...." 327

24 Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm going to raise a 328  
 25 question that I think is aligned to this. I don't know how the 329  
 26 other Members of the House feel about it, especially on this 330  
 27 side of the aisle. But until I know what is in these 331  
 28 Amendments, with some kind of analysis before us, I intend to 332  
 29 vote 'no' on everyone of them. It just does not make sense for 333  
 30 us to sit here and try to intelligently vote on concurrence  
 31 which is final action on stuff that we don't even know what we 334  
 32 are voting on. You have it presented before you, many of these 335  
 33 Amendments that has been indicated before changes to concept or 336  
 34 the direction of the Bill entirely. Representative Getty is 337  
 35 correct, you don't know what they are doing. And you got the  
 36 Bill presented and you got the concurrences presented before 338



1 you for final, for final action. I think before we can do 339  
2 that, we need to have some indication, each Member needs to 340  
3 have some indication or some analysis of what these 341  
4 concurrences are doing. They change the whole caricature of 342  
5 the Bill. You have the Amendment, but you try to figure out  
6 what they are doing. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker and not trying 343  
7 to be dilatorious that it is just, we're are finding that we 344  
8 are in the main voting on subject matter of stuff that we 345  
9 defeated here in the House when it went to the Senate. And now 346  
10 we're back voting on concurrences and don't know what's in it."

11 Speaker Redmond: "I've been advised that the analysis of the 348  
12 Amendments has been distributed through the Post Office to the 349  
13 Members in their office. That's on the Democratic side. Now, 350  
14 I've been further advised that it's impossible to distribute 351  
15 them, you know, and keep everybody's bill book up. Now do you 352  
16 know whether or not these Amendments have been distributed?" 353

17 E.M. Barnes: "Well Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have on their desks 354  
18 explanation in detail of each one of the concurrences. Now we 355  
19 have staff and I deal with staff and I'm not being critical of 356  
20 them. But if they could distribute those to individual 357  
21 Members, they could have put them together in one continuous 358  
22 run to have them available to us at this important time so we  
23 can flip through to know what's going on with each individual 359  
24 Amendment. Now we have staff, and if they can't do that, I 360  
25 question some of the wisdom of all of the staff that we have 361  
26 around here. And I'm not one that ever comes down hard on  
27 staff. But when those concurrences and those explanations was 362  
28 coming over from the Senate, if they could have kept just one 363  
29 continuous roll, or one complete copy of all of those that come 364  
30 over and simply ran them off and made copies, if that's all 365  
31 that it takes. Now otherwise you put the responsibility on us 366  
32 here, among all the additional responsibilities that we have  
33 already. Now I cannot understand, how if the minority party 367  
34 can provide for those Members information relative to what in 368  
35 those concurrences is now resting reposing on those desks, why 369  
36 can't we can't do the same thing." 370

1 Speaker Redmond: "We'll look into it Representative Barnes. It was  
2 elected to do it through the Post Office. Now, if that isn't  
3 working, why we'll change it. Representative Friedrich."

4 Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker. This Amendment was carefully worked out  
5 between Mr. Brady, the Legislative Audit Commission and the  
6 Auditor General. I think it's the best of two worlds. The  
7 Auditor General had some problems the way it was being handled  
8 and the first suggestion was that it would self-destruct  
9 anytime the Department of Administrative Services was able to  
10 take over. That was not agreeable and now it is... it was a  
11 time certain and I think that all the problems have been worked  
12 out Representative Getty, that to where there's no problem with  
13 it. The University of Illinois is satisfied with it, the  
14 Auditor General's is satisfied with it, the Legislative Audit  
15 Commission is satisfied with it. I was in on the agreement, so  
16 I'm sure that's true."

17 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

18 Huff: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. You've already had sufficient  
19 dialogue with reference to the Senate Amendments and I just  
20 wanted to echo what Representative Barnes was saying. I  
21 stopped at the Senate Bill Room this morning and was notified  
22 that the Amendment that I'm waiting for on 524, hasn't been  
23 printed. So, we do have a problem. I've already taken that  
24 Bill out of the record a couple of times."

25 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

26 Skinner: "I have a substantive question of the Sponscr."

27 Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

28 Skinner: "Are you assuring us that there will be no diversion from  
29 this fund, to other ah to other university expenditures which  
30 ought to appropriated?"

31 Wikoff: "Yes."

32 Skinner: "Thank you."

33 Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on  
34 Representative Wikoff's motion that the House concur in Senate  
35 Amendment 1 on House Bill 1541. Those in favor vote 'aye',  
36 oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

1 wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there  
 2 107 'aye' and 7 'no' and the House does concur on Senat  
 3 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1541. 1193. Representative Getty.  
 4 Getty: "Mr. Speaker, you know I think I really ought to verify this  
 5 I don't think the people realize they just repealed liability  
 6 insurance as of 1982, for University of Illinois police. No  
 7 that's absolutely insane, they only meant to repeal the special  
 8 self-insurance provisions, but the the Senate Amendment repeal  
 9 the entire provision. I just can't imagine that we really want  
 10 to do that."

11 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff. Wikoff."

12 Wikoff: "Mr. Speaker, I don't really believe that's the intent  
 13 because what and... Representative Getty... I don't agree with  
 14 your interpretation of this because what was originally  
 15 intended on this was that the Department of Administrative  
 16 Services take over this whole situation. The University is in  
 17 complete agreement with it, that they are willing to go with  
 18 them. And this is the reason for it and the reason of the  
 19 repealer date was on there was so that it didn't go in for  
 20 ah... from now on and the University is in complete agreement  
 21 When the Department of Administrative Services is willing and  
 22 able and has the capacity to take this over that they will do  
 23 so. So I really don't see any problem with this. I for one  
 24 will ah, can give you my word that if we see one coming I'll do  
 25 what I can to change it."

26 Getty: "The problem, if we concur, it goes to the Governor. There's  
 27 nothing further to do. I have no problem with the repealer of  
 28 the self-insurance provisions, but that isn't what it says. It  
 29 says you're repealing the entire Section 7a, which repeals  
 30 liability insurance for University of Illinois police. Now  
 31 that's just crazy."

32 Wikoff: "Well again, the university and no one else is going to go  
 33 along and not insure their people."

34 Getty: "Well, we have the responsibility here in the Legislature to  
 35 make sure that the laws are done properly, not just guessing on  
 36 it. Mr. Speaker I'll just... maybe if we'd just take a new

1 Roll Call to make sure everything is done properly. I don't 449  
2 think people understood what they were doing." 450

3 Anonymous: "Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. Didn't you announce 451  
4 the result of this Roll Call? And that is was passed?" 453

5 Speaker Redmond: "Yeah. I did announce the results. When can I get 454  
6 it? Representative Getty. Is the motion for verification in 455  
7 order Mr. Parliamentarian? Okay. He advises me it is until 456  
8 I've gone to the next item, which I have not done. 457  
9 Representative Getty has requested a verification.  
10 Representative Matijevich." 459

11 Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, change me to 'no'." 461

12 Speaker Redmond: "We are going to have a verification. We are going 462  
13 to have verification. Representative Wikoff has moved for a 463  
14 poll of the absentees. Representative Ryan." 465

15 Ryan: "What Bill are you talking about, Mr. Speaker?" 467

16 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff's Bill." 469

17 Ryan: "You've got it right now, you had it wrong on the board before. 470  
18 I don't know for sure. All right now you've got it right. 471  
19 Okay." 472

20 Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Leone has it right. Proceed with a poll of the 473  
21 absentees. Let's not start today that way Mr. Collins. We're 474  
22 going to have a verification, he's within his rights. 475  
23 Representative Barnes." 476

24 E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Just before the 477  
25 verification, which is on it, can I be switched from 'present' 478  
26 to 'no'?" 479

27 Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman to 'no'. Representative 480  
28 Schneider, 'no'. Representative White, 'no'. Braun. 481  
29 Representative Braun." 482

30 Braun: "I'd like to change my vote from 'present' to 'no'. But Mr. 483  
31 Speaker I'd like to second Representative Barnes comment 484  
32 earlier. I think the reason we are engaged in this debate and 485  
33 engaged in the middle of this verification, is because many of 486  
34 us do not have analysis of the concurrence motions. And I 487  
35 would suggest Mr. Speaker, that it would be in the interest of  
36 the orderly process of business this morning, if we would go to 488

1 another order of business so that we can know what we are 489  
 2 voting on. It's a very uncomfortable feeling sitting here 490  
 3 voting on something and not knowing whether or not you just 491  
 4 repealed the Constitution of the State of Illinois." 492

5 Speaker Redmond: "Okay, I think your point is well taken. But just 493  
 6 ah... I have asked 'Mr. McGraw' the legal advisor to the 494  
 7 Speaker, to check with the Gentleman whose responsibility it 495  
 8 was to distribute those to the offices. And to find out if 496  
 9 they were distributed and if our system isn't right, we'll 497  
 10 change the system." 498

11 Braun: "Thank you." 500

12 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins." 502

13 Collins: "Mr. Speaker, you've just admonished me and I presume to 503  
 14 admonished you, then let's not start the week by breaking the 504  
 15 rules. Now Mr. Speaker, listen to me. You did call the next 505  
 16 Bill, the Gentleman is not within his rights to ask for a 506  
 17 verification." 507

18 Speaker Redmond: "Having voted on the prevailing side by which 508  
 19 Amendment #1 was concurred in, I now move that that vote be 509  
 20 reconsidered. I did vote. Representative Flinn, for what 510  
 21 purpose do you rise?" 511

22 Flinn: "Well Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side by 512  
 23 which House Bill 1541 was finally passed, I move to reconsider 513  
 24 the vote by which it passed." 514

25 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi moves that that lie on the 515  
 26 table. Representative Flinn moves that the vote be 516  
 27 reconsidered. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', oppose 'no', the 517  
 28 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. Motion carries. The vote 518  
 29 is reconsidered. Mr. Collins we've got a lot of work to do and 519  
 30 there is no sense, there is no sense in proceeding on this. 520  
 31 Representative Ryan." 521

32 Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, now you know your wrong. The Gentleman is 522  
 33 entitled to a Roll Call on that motion. You ought to give it 523  
 34 to him. You're starting out the last week of this session in 524  
 35 very poor taste and in a bad way. And I would suggest you go 525  
 36 back and do this thing right. You know the difference, so 526

1 operate that way, would you please?" 527

2 Speaker Redmond: "That's what I'm trying to do." 529

3 Ryan: "The man asked for a Roll Call, he's entitled to it, give it to 530

4 him." 531

5 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi." 533

6 Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest we take this out of the 534

7 record and come back to it." 536

8 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff. If it's acceptable to 537

9 Representative Wikoff, we'll take it out of the record. That 538

10 is the motion to reconsider. 142. Representative Davis. 142. 539

11 No, 185, I guess that's the simplest one." 540

12 Davis: "Yes, ah on the Order of Nonconcurrence Mr. Speaker, appears 541

13 Senate Bill 185. I would move to refuse to recede from House 542

14 Amendment #1 and a Conference Committee be appointed." 544

15 Speaker Redmond: "What page was that on?" 546

16 Davis: "Sir that's on page 11, I believe. No wait. Excuse me, page 547

17 12. Page 12 Sir." 548

18 Speaker Redmond: "On page 12 under the Order of Noncurrence, appears 549

19 Senate Bill 185. Representative Davis." 551

20 Davis: "Well thank you Sir. Senate Bill 185, I move the House refuse 552

21 to recede from House Amendment #1 and that a Conference 553

22 Committee be appointed." 554

23 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite, for what purpose do 555

24 you rise?" 556

25 Satterthwaite: "Has the Amendment been distributed?" 558

26 Speaker Redmond: "Has it been distributed? I've been advised, it 559

27 has." 560

28 Davis: "Well it was a House Amendment." 562

29 Satterthwaite: "Oh, okay." 564

30 Speaker Redmond: "It was a House Amendment to Senate Bill." 566

31 Davis: "Yes Sir." 568

32 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten." 570

33 Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor indicate what the 571

34 House Amendment is that we're talking about? Mr. Speaker, 572

35 would the Sponsor indicate what the Amendment is... Mr. Speaker 573

36 would you recognize Mr. Davis, so he could respond to the 574

1 question?" 575

2 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis." 577

3 Davis: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker. Representative Totten, the 578  
4 Amendment, it was an agreed Amendment in the Judiciary 579  
5 Committee that narrows the scope of the Bill and it took out 580  
6 some language that sounded objectionable. However, the 581  
7 Amendment is slightly flawed in the language intent, that the 582  
8 Senate wanted to put back in. And that's the reason for the 583  
9 Conference Committee. It's going to be a rather nonsubstantive 584  
10 change in the Amendment. It will be substantially the same. 585  
11 The Amendment reduced the penalty from Class X to Class 1 and 586  
12 narrowed the range of offenses for penal institutions 587  
13 possession of firearms." 587

14 Totten: "Okay. Is it your intent to insist that it be a Class X 588  
15 felony?" 589

16 Davis: "No it is not at this point, simply because the Senate Sponsor 590  
17 is going along with the program of the House." 592

18 Totten: "All right." 594

19 Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's 595  
20 motion that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 to 596  
21 Senate Bill 185. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye' 597  
22 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carries. The 598  
23 House refuses to recede from Amendment 1. Did you request a 599  
24 Conference Committee, did you? And a Conference Committee will  
25 be appointed. On page 12 on the Order of Concurrence 600  
26 Consideration Postponed. House Bill 681. We're having a 601  
27 little problem with the Roll Call machine here. So let's have 602  
28 a couple of test Roll Calls for attendance. Test Roll Call for 603  
29 attendance. The last Roll Call didn't record that  
30 Representative Walsh was in the chamber. Have to have another 604  
31 test. Roll Call for attendance. Attendance. That one showed 605  
32 Walsh voting 'no'. Will the first runner up in the Mr. 606  
33 Wonderful contest, does he desire to be recognized? First  
34 runner up. I understand that was Representative Jaffe." 608

35 Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I think that just shows that there's a change in 609  
36 the trend of time. You know, raw animal magnetism is dead. 610

1 You know impersonations are in. I think that's what the story 611  
2 is today." 612

3 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer." 614

4 Dyer: "Can I ask for a point of personal privilege?" 616

5 Speaker Redmond: "Right now?" 618

6 Dyer: "I also need to get on the Roll Call and I didn't get my button 619  
7 pushed in time." 620

8 Speaker Redmond: "I didn't get on either. My goodness and I pushed 621  
9 the button." 622

10 Dyer: "If we could open up the Roll Call a minute." 624

11 Speaker Redmond: "We'll take one more Roll Call. Roll Call for 625  
12 attendance. Mine doesn't work. Representative Bowman." 627

13 Bowman: "Inquiry of the chair, Mr. Speaker. With all these Roll 628  
14 Calls for attendance, does that mean we get 3 per diem 629  
15 allowances?" 630

16 Speaker Redmond: "Everybody that signs an affidavit has earned title 631  
17 to it. I don't know whether it's 'Ackerman' or who it is now, 632  
18 but. Representative Dyer. For point of personal privilege." 633

19 Dyer: "Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make the announcement you 635  
20 have all been waiting for, about who is really truly Mr. 636  
21 Wonderful in the Illinois General Assembly. But first I want 637  
22 to thank every one of you who supported the Conference of Women 638  
23 Legislators fund raising event last night. It was a success 639  
24 beyond their wildest dreams. I want to thank all those who 640  
25 were Mr. almost Wonderful; Roy Sandquist, Gordon Ropp, Clyde 641  
26 Robbins, Jesse White, Larry Bullock, Herb Huskey, Bay Ewell, 642  
27 Woody Bowman, Tim Johnson, Don Deuster, Nord Swanstrom, Tony 643  
28 Steczo, Terry Steczo, excuse me, Aaron Jaffe, Harold Katz, Jack 644  
29 Davis, Phil Rock who said unless he was elected Mr. Wonderful, 645  
30 none of their Bills would pass in the Senate. I want to thank 646  
31 all of them for being good sports and entering into the spirit 647  
32 of the thing. And now let's all here it for Mr. Wonderful 648  
33 himself, John Cullerton. He isn't there." 649

34 Speaker Redmond: "His fiancée has recalled him to Chicago. 649  
35 Representative Skinner." 650

36 Skinner: "Mr. Speaker I think it should be noted that it's 'Gay Pride 651



1 Week'."

652

2 Speaker Redmond: "Well let's try something that we have to do now, if  
3 we have enough attendance. On page 2, Senate Bills Third  
4 Reading, Short Debate. Senate Bill 263. Representative  
5 Waddell, for what purpose do you rise?"

653

654

655

656

6 Waddell: "Mr. Speaker I think it should be noted that this is also  
7 the week called 'Gay's for Gacy'."

657

659

8 Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 263. A Bill for An Act to amend sections  
9 of An Act in relation to the adoption of persons. Third  
10 Reading of the Bill."

660

661

662

11 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

664

12 Greisheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 263, Sponsored by  
13 Senator Maragos is the Senate, was originally the Senate  
14 version of the adoption Bill, to allow adopted children to find  
15 out their heritage and their and their medical background. The  
16 Bill was placed in the Judiciary Committee in the House. The  
17 House Bill was amended on its entirety. You'll recall that  
18 Representative Schlickman and I had somewhat of a discussion  
19 about this on the House floor. The Bill as it now stands is  
20 identical to the Bill that was previously passed by the House.  
21 I would urge its passage."

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

22 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greisheimer, I had a little  
23 interference. Would you tell me what you did?"

674

676

24 Greisheimer: "Mr. Speaker I just pointed out to the House that the  
25 Bill as it now stands is identical to the one passed by the  
26 House approximately a month and a half ago and urged its  
27 passage."

677

678

679

680

28 Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Question is, shall this Bill  
29 pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Have all  
30 voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the  
31 record. On this question there is 117 'ayes' and 20 'no' and  
32 the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby  
33 declared passed. 565. Representative Marovitz."

681

682

683

684

685

686

34 Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 565. A Bill for An Act to amend sections  
35 of the Retail Installment Sales Act and the Motor Vehicle  
36 Retail Installments Sales Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

687

688

690

1 Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Marovitz here? Out of the 691  
2 record. 651. Is Lechowicz here? Out of the record. 768. 692  
3 O'Brien here? Out of the record. 1038. Ewing." 694

4 Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1038. A Bill for An Act in relation to 695  
5 the penalties for failing to file and for filing fraudulent tax 696  
6 returns and amending certain acts in relation thereto. Third 697  
7 Reading of the Bill." 698

8 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing." 700

9 Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is one 701  
10 of the 'mirage' series of Bills. This is a Senate Bill which 702  
11 has been passed overwhelmingly in the Senate. Sent over here, 703  
12 it was heard in the Revenue Committee and came out of Committee 704  
13 with no negative votes. It increases the penalties for those 705  
14 people filing fraudulent tax returns under the Income, the 706  
15 Motor Fuel, the Sales, the Cigarette and the Liquor Tax Act.  
16 We discussed this Bill the other day and the question was 707  
17 raised if the words knowingly filed or help prepare were in 708  
18 there. This has been checked by both sides, and I think that 709  
19 everybody is satisfied at least that that wording is in the  
20 act." 710

21 Speaker Redmond: "Is there anyone in opposition? Representative 711  
22 Brummer." 712

23 Brummer: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think it's very 713  
24 important that the Members look closely at this Bill and what 714  
25 it does. We had a Bill here sponsored by Representative 715  
26 O'Brien which was less severe and did not meet the approval of 716  
27 this House, was resoundingly defeated. This Bill, this 717  
28 legislation would impose a Class IV felony conviction upon not  
29 only the tax violator, but also the preparer who was involved 718  
30 in certain types of ah tax returns that may be filed. In 719  
31 addition to that, if the conviction is based or relates to a 720  
32 tax liability in excess of \$1,000, the court shall impose a 721  
33 minimum sentence which is more severe than the language that ah 722  
34 contained in the Bill that we previously had. In response to  
35 the Sponsor's comment about it being, about knowingly being in 723  
36 there, I think it's interesting to look at various portions of 724

1 the Bill. Now I would specifically refer you to page 3, 725  
2 Section 5, which says any person or tax preparer for any person 726  
3 who files or causes to be filed or signs or causes to be signed  
4 any false return or report to the Department as to any fact or 727  
5 material, is guilty of a Class III felony. Specifically in 728  
6 that section there is no mental state required. That would 729  
7 mean that any tax preparer who filed a return, not knowing that 730  
8 it was fraudulent, but just the fact that he prepared the 731  
9 return, even though he did not know it was fraudulent, would be 732  
10 guilty of a Class III felony. I would suggest that you're not 734  
11 going to get any tax preparer, if they are aware of this 734  
12 language to prepare any return, because they would be guilty of 735  
13 a Class III felony, even though they did not know that it was 736  
14 fraudulent, had know idea that it was fraudulent and would 736  
15 nevertheless be guilty of a Class III felony under that 737  
16 specific section. I would remind you this is more restrictive, 738  
17 more harsh than the legislation that was previously defeated 739  
18 here resoundingly. And once again, at least in one section 739  
19 there is no mental state required. I would urge a resounding 740  
20 'no' vote on this Bill." 741

21 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber." 743

22 Leinenweber: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?" 745

23 Speaker Redmond: "He will." 747

24 Leinenweber: "Now Representative Ewing, I too am a little concerned 748  
25 over the language in regard to the tax preparer. In your 749  
26 opinion, to what extent would the tax preparer be liable for 750  
27 criminal, under this act, for criminal violation if he prepared 751  
28 and filed or prepared for signature for his client a return 752  
29 which he had reasonable grounds to believe it probably was  
30 fraudulent because, lets say ah it's a sales tax return ah, an 754  
31 'ROT' return which for I would say a bar, which appeared to be 755  
32 substantially, showed sales substantially lower than he thinks 756  
33 that the he, his client actually made. Does he have an  
34 obligation, in your opinion, in order to satisfy the 757  
35 requirements of this law to make an independent study. For 758  
36 example, to see how much business the client actually did have, 759

1 so he could make an independent judgment that the return is 760  
2 understated?" 761

3 Ewing: "Representative Leinenweber I wish I could answer that 762  
4 question with all surety, but it is a little involved. I 763  
5 really ah my intention as the Sponsor of this legislation is 764  
6 that it would be the judicial definition of knowingly. I think 765  
7 if you are presented with the information from your client, 766  
8 that you are not under an obligation under this act to conduct  
9 an audit of his business to see that he is honestly providing 767  
10 you that information. It would not be my intent that the law 768  
11 should be so restrictive that a tax preparer would have to have 769  
12 any kind of verification of what the information the client 770  
13 gave him. I don't know if that answers your question." 771

14 Leinenweber: "Well it clarifies your intention, but I wonder whether 772  
15 or not the language is actually ah it would be clear enough so 773  
16 that ah what I'm concerned about is the same point that 774  
17 Representative Brummer is concerned about that it will make it 775  
18 either exceedingly expensive or difficult for a say a tavern 776  
19 owner to get a bookkeeper or a CPA to a prepare a return for 777  
20 him, if there is this potential threat that if the client is  
21 actually understating his proceeds from his ah say the sale of 778  
22 alcoholic beverages in his tavern, that he might be criminally 779  
23 liable for preparing the return. Now I just wonder whether or 780  
24 not in your opinion the language is crystal clear enough to 781  
25 indicate that we are not requiring this type of audit, so to 782  
26 speak, on the part of a bookkeeper who probably wouldn't even  
27 be competent to conduct such an audit, but merely knows how to 783  
28 assembly the figures and put them into the right blanks on the 784  
29 return and indicate what the liability or the tax liability is 785  
30 to his client. I share those concerns and I don't think I 786  
31 could support the Bill unless I was assured that the language  
32 is crystal clear on this respect." 788

33 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe." 790

34 Jaffe: "Would the Gentleman yield to a question? I really ah I don't 791  
35 know what my position is, but on Senate Amendment 2 it says in 792  
36 who's persons who withholds or collects some employees wages, 793

1 Illinois Income Tax is required by this act. So we're talking 794  
2 about an employer, is that correct? Representative Ewing." 796  
3 Ewing: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear the question." 798  
4 Jaffe: "Over here. On this Senate Amendment 1, I'm looking at the 799  
5 Digest. It says includes persons who withhold or collect from 800  
6 employees wages, Illinois Income Tax is required by this act. 801  
7 So we're talking about an employer, is that correct?" 803  
8 Ewing: "Yes." 805  
9 Jaffe: "Well what happens, say the employee says well, I don't want 806  
10 ah instead of taking five exemptions, which I'm lawfully 807  
11 entitled to, ah I only want to take 1, because I don't want to 808  
12 pay tax at the end of the year, I might want to have something 809  
13 coming. That actually is overpaying his tax. Would that 810  
14 person ah would the employer then be guilty of a fraudulent act  
15 under this Bill?" 811  
16 Ewing: "I think there are provisions in the Illinois Income Tax where 812  
17 you can put down for less de... ah more deductions ah not more 813  
18 deductions than you have but under certain conditions you can 814  
19 go in and have your withholding changed. I believe if it were 815  
20 conducted in this is you know ah I'm not an expert in that act 816  
21 or in answering your question, but I would believe that if it's 817  
22 above board, if it's within the provisions of the income tax 818  
23 law, then you would not knowingly be doing a fraudulent act."  
24 Jaffe: "Well wouldn't it be knowingly, if I said to my employer, I 820  
25 really have five deductions, I want to take out one and I'm 821  
26 really paying more tax, I mean I'm actually telling them to 822  
27 take out more tax than what they ought to do, but I'm really 823  
28 giving them information which is not true. Are you sure that 824  
29 that's covered by the Income Tax Act? Otherwise I'd have 825  
30 hesitancy ah you know supporting it, but if that's covered by 826  
31 the Income Tax Act, then I could support the Bill." 828  
32 Ewing: "I can't answer that question without checking the Income Tax 829  
33 Act to see about that." 831  
34 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz." 833  
35 Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield for a couple of quick questions?" 834  
36 Speaker Redmond: "He will." 837

1 Leverenz: "You have ah what are the penalties you have in here? You 838  
2 have a host of different ones." 840

3 Ewing: "It's a Class IV felony." 842

4 Leverenz: "Why does it say then, Class III?" 844

5 Ewing: "Where are you referring?" 846

6 Leverenz: "I think it's page 3. On page 3, line 28, you have Class 847  
7 III felony. And a Class III felony is two to five years. It 848  
8 just appears that the Bill is not uniform and you do not have 849  
9 that willfully or knowingly in every section. I would strongly 850  
10 suggest that you pull it out. I had an identical tax preparer 851  
11 act Bill, we did amend the whole thing down, it did get to 852  
12 Third Reading. We just didn't have time to move it, but I 853  
13 don't believe the uniformity is there and I think it will end 854  
14 up like what happened the first year of the federal penalties 854  
15 were in effect and that is that they just didn't chase any of 855  
16 them because there were so many of them." 856

17 Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I though the other day when this ah legislation 857  
18 was called, that these questions had been answered. At least 858  
19 the questions concerning the knowingly. And I would like to 859  
20 take it out of the record until I ah..." 860

21 Speaker Redmond: "Okay, out of the record. 1072. Out of the record. 861  
22 1172. Representative Stuffle here? Out of the record. 1342. 862  
23 Representative Peters, you want that one? 1342. 863  
24 Representative Kempiners, will you please stop interrupting 864  
25 Representative Peters. Do you want 1342, Representative 865  
26 Peters? Out of the record. Okay, go back and talk to him. I  
27 think just before Representative Collins addressed the chair, 866  
28 we were on the Order of Concurrence with House Bill 681. 867  
29 Representative Reed." 868

30 Reed: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 869  
31 681 permits the sale of alcohol in the five state park lodges 870  
32 until midnight. Senate Amendment #1 permits liquor to be sold 871  
33 the Lakeview Museum in Peoria, in connection with the service 872  
34 of food. I ask that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 873  
35 to House Bill 681." 874

36 Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? The question... 875

1 Representative McPike." 876

2 McPike: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Point of order. We went to 877  
3 Consideration Postponed on Concurrence. The first one on that 878  
4 order is House Bill 608 of which I'm the Sponsor. Why did we 879  
5 skip that and move to 681?" 880

6 Speaker Redmond: "Because the Sponsor of 681 indicated that she was 881  
7 ready and the Sponsor of 608 did not. That's one thing and 882  
8 another thing is, you only get one more crack. And if we call 883  
9 it before your ready, why you may regret it. She seemed to 884  
10 think that it would be all right on this one. If you want it 885  
11 called, why it will be. 608. The question is on 886  
12 Representative Reed's motion that the House concur in Senate 886  
13 Amendment 1 to House Bill 681. Those in favor vote 'aye', 887  
14 oppose vote 'no'. Representative Peters." 888

15 Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This 889  
16 legislation as you know was heard yesterday and I must indicate 890  
17 that sometimes in the haste and sometimes in the intensity to 891  
18 which we feel for certain kinds of issues, we end up getting 892  
19 mixed in our minds the proper role we should be playing. I 893  
20 objected to this legislation yesterday, for reasons I frankly 894  
21 declared to House that were ah other than what has to do with 894  
22 the legislation. For that I publicly apologize to 895  
23 Representative Reed. It was not my intention to hurt her 896  
24 legislation or to cast any ill light on it. And I wanted to 897  
25 make that statement, Mr. Speaker for the record and cast my 898  
26 vote 'aye'." 899

27 Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 900  
28 record. On this question there is 125 'aye' and 13 'no'. And 901  
29 the House does... the motion carries and the House does concur 902  
30 in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 681. Now Representative 903  
31 McPike do you want 608 called? 608. Representative McPike." 904

32 McPike: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 906  
33 Last night just previous to the little problems on the floor 907  
34 with House Bill 681, we tried to take House Bill 608 out of the 908  
35 record because of a lack of attendance. And for that reason, 909  
36 or for whatever reasons it was put on Postponed Consideration 910

1 instead. Now those people that got up to speak last night, 911  
 2 addressed themselves to the Bill and not to the Amendment. And 912  
 3 if that's the case today, I suppose that would have to be my  
 4 closing remarks on the Bill. But just to the Amendment itself, 913  
 5 when this Bill left the House, there was still concern by those 914  
 6 people involved in special education that this Bill was not 915  
 7 tight enough. Specifically, Representative Hallstrom asked me 916  
 8 if I wouldn't consider an additional Amendment being placed on  
 9 in the Senate that would tighten the language in this Bill so 917  
 10 that... so to further protect the field of special education. 918  
 11 We did that by saying that the transfer funds could not exceed 919  
 12 \$135,000 and it furthermore, the school district would have to 920  
 13 have a deficit in its operations building and maintenance fund. 921  
 14 This restricts... this... this language is more strict than the 922  
 15 language leaving the House. I think it makes it a better Bill  
 16 and for those reasons I would move to concur in Senate  
 17 Amendment #1." 924

18 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson." 926

19 Vinson: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question, Mr. Speaker?" 928

20 Speaker Redmond: "He will." 930

21 Vinson: "The one question I never quite got answered last night, 931  
 22 Representative McPike, that I wonder if you could enlighten me 932  
 23 on today. The underlying tax, the special education tax, must 933  
 24 there be a referendum to raise, to initially raise that tax?" 934

25 McPike: "That tax ah no. That tax was imposed in this particular 936  
 26 school district from 1970 until 1974. It has not been imposed 937  
 27 since. We're trying to transfer the monies that were raised 938  
 28 during that four year period. And the Bill calls for a 939  
 29 referendum in order to make that transfer." 940

30 Vinson: "So, all the referendum will go to is what the money should 941  
 31 be spent for? It won't go to whether the money should be 942  
 32 raised at all?" 943

33 McPike: "The money has already been raised, so the referendum will 944  
 34 not address itself to that, you're correct. The money is in a 945  
 35 bank account sitting idly." 946

36 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallstrom." 948



1 Hallstrom: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 949  
 2 House. I did talk to this issue yesterday. I hope that the 950  
 3 Members of the House do realize that there is a referendum 951  
 4 involved with this. I know there's a question about returning 952  
 5 the money to the taxpayers. My understanding is, that this 953  
 6 money would not be transferred at all to the general education 954  
 7 fund if the people in that particular district did not want it 954  
 8 to. I do urge the Members of the House to support this. As I 955  
 9 said yesterday, Representative McPike has done everything he 956  
 10 can and along with that Senate Amendment to tighten this up. 957  
 11 And you know that I would not be speaking for it if I hurt... 958  
 12 felt that it hurt taxpayers or special education funds. I urge 959  
 13 you to adopt this Amendment." 960

14 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider." 962

15 Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I don't 963  
 16 know what the apprehension is. All the safeguards that 964  
 17 everyone has ever requested in either acquiring public monies 965  
 18 or re-shifting it are in the Bill. It does provide for the 966  
 19 referendum, it does provide for regional superintendent's to 967  
 20 certify to the State Superintendent of Education that adequate 968  
 21 provisions have been made for all the district's handicapped 969  
 22 children even before you can make the shift. So it's ah, it's 969  
 23 ah pretty as we say narrowly drawn Bill. I don't believe it 970  
 24 affects anybody else's district, but Representative McPike's. 971  
 25 And I don't see why we should be opposed to it. Inasmuch as he 972  
 26 also has a provision that will have kind of a sunset effect, 973  
 27 which means it ends in June of 81. So ah, I think it's an easy 974  
 28 Bill to support and I don't know how it's engendered to much 974  
 29 controversy. And I would also encourage an 'aye' vote." 976

30 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler." 978

31 Birchler: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. This is a situation where the 979  
 32 people of the district did what the law said, to make a levee 980  
 33 to collect money to build a building for the special education. 981  
 34 And then they didn't need it. The money is there, there's no 982  
 35 way you can move it unless you do it the way that the Bill 983  
 36 provides. Now there's all the protection that you need because 984

1 the people of the district that provided the money will have a 985  
 2 right to vote to transfer the money. And I urge an 'aye' vote  
 3 on this Bill." 986

4 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh." 988

5 Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 989  
 6 First of all, I'd like to make the point that it is perfectly 990  
 7 proper to discuss the Bill as well as the Senate Amendment. We 991  
 8 must take into consideration that we are voting on final 992  
 9 passage here, and not just simply the Senate Amendment. A 993  
 10 failure to get 89 votes, means that this Bill as well as any 994  
 11 Bill that fails to get 89 votes on a motion to concur, does not  
 12 pass. So I submit to you, that it's perfectly proper to 995  
 13 discuss the entire Bill including the Senate Amendment. Now 996  
 14 with respect to this Bill, Mr. Speaker, it's deceiving. We're 997  
 15 talking about a levee for special education facilities. Now 998  
 16 that suggests a levee for capital, and as I understand it, that  
 17 levee did not require in 1970 or up to 1974 that there be a 999  
 18 referendum. Now what we're doing, is we're taking money that 1000  
 19 resulted from that levee and putting that into operations. Now 1001  
 20 the fact that there is a referendum for that, I think is 1002  
 21 further deceiving the taxpayers, because we tell the taxpayers 1003  
 22 in connection with the referendum, that look, it's not going to 1004  
 23 cost you anything. Well that isn't entirely accurate, it is 1005  
 24 going to cost them something. It's going to cost them \$135,000  
 25 maximum that they have in that fund. It's going to cost them 1006  
 26 that without any reduction in the operations fund. Now it 1007  
 27 seemed to me, Mr. Speaker, that what we could do with this 1008  
 28 Bill, is put it in a Conference Committee and have suggested to 1009  
 29 that Conference Committee that we further tighten this up by  
 30 providing that the levee for operations shall be reduced by an 1010  
 31 amount that would equal this \$135,000 maximum. Then we would 1011  
 32 indeed have it tight, then we could do away with this fund and 1012  
 33 then the taxpayers would get some benefit. So I urge you to 1013  
 34 defeat this motion and maybe send this Bill to a Conference 1014  
 35 Committee to do that." 1015

36 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey." 1017

1 Huskey: "Well Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?" 1019

2 Speaker Redmond: "He will." 1021

3 Huskey: "Ah Representative McPike, does this apply only to your 1022  
4 'Venus' School District 3? Could it be used in my school 1023  
5 districts back home?" 1024

6 McPike: "It could be used in your school district, if your 1025  
7 superintendent certifies that the funds are not needed for 1026  
8 special education. If you hold a referendum and the voter's 1027  
9 approve it. If you do it before July 1981. If you have a 1028  
10 deficit in your operations buildings and maintenance fund and 1029  
11 if you do not transfer over \$135,000, yes indeed, your school  
12 district can also do it." 1031

13 Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative McPike to close. 1032  
14 Representative Totten." 1034

15 Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1035  
16 I rise in opposition to the motion to concur for many of the 1036  
17 same reasons that Representative Walsh got up. It just seems 1037  
18 inconceivable that we would take monies from one fund that was 1038  
19 levied for a specific purpose and then because we have a 1039  
20 problem in another fund, try and transfer it there even with a 1040  
21 referendum, even with a referendum provision that's in the  
22 Bill. What in effect we're doing, is taking monies raised for 1041  
23 one purpose and putting them in a fund for an entirely 1042  
24 different purpose. There is no thought given to the fact that 1043  
25 the taxpayers are going to have to foot the Bill for the whole 1044  
26 thing anyway and that the monies, if they are going to be 1045  
27 transferred, should rightfully be transferred with a  
28 corresponding decrease in the rate for the operation budget. 1046  
29 As long as this is not going to be done in this Bill as 1047  
30 proposed and presented to us today, I think the motion to 1048  
31 concur ought to be defeated." 1049

32 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle." 1051

33 Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. I rise in support of 1052  
34 Representative McPike and the motion to concur in the Senate 1053  
35 Amendment. The Amendment indeed restricts the Bill further 1054  
36 than the House version went out of here. Secondly, there's no 1055

1 question, the issue remains one of local control here. 1056  
 2 Representative McPike has substantially provided for local  
 3 control by a direct referendum. It is a very limited Bill. It 1057  
 4 is up to the people in the district he is working for. There 1058  
 5 would be few, if any other districts involved. And for those 1059  
 6 reasons, I would urge an affirmative vote on the motion to 1060  
 7 concur in the Senate Amendment." 1061

8 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner." 1062

9 Skinner: "If this is really just for one school district, why are we 1063  
 10 going to allow a two-year period for this referendum to be 1064  
 11 held? And why isn't it required that it be held at a general 1065  
 12 election, not a special election? I can see school districts 1066  
 13 and my district holding an election on December 23rd, which or 1067  
 14 whatever the Saturday is before Christmas, whenever everybody 1068  
 15 who will go to the polls will feel goodhearted and vote 'yes', 1069  
 16 just because it's near Christmas and those few who do go will 1070  
 17 of course be captives of the school district. No one else will 1071  
 18 care, because they will have more important things to do. This 1072  
 19 Bill could be much more restrictive and for that reason I urge 1073  
 20 we send it to a Conference Committee." 1074

21 Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike." 1075

22 McPike: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I suppose there were different 1076  
 23 options when the Bill come back from the Senate. We could 1077  
 24 certainly have moved to nonconcur and had the Senate rescind 1078  
 25 from the Amendment, which would have meant that the Bill could 1079  
 26 have been less restrictive. But I agreed with Representative 1080  
 27 Hallstrom to try to amend it so as to satisfy her concerns and 1081  
 28 the concerns of a number of people that are involved with 1082  
 special education. I think we have done that. I think 1083  
 everybody understands the Bill. I don't know what ah those 1084  
 that got up ah spoke against would have us do with these funds. 1085  
 There sitting idle now. They have sat idle for six years. And 1086  
 if this Bill doesn't pass, they will sit idle for another six 1087  
 years. We could pretend like we'd like to give these back to 1088  
 the people in this district, that is the funds, but everybody 1089  
 knows that those that paid taxes in 1970 to 74 probably 25% of 1090

1 um don't even live in that district. It's not even a practical 1090  
2 solution to this. We've got this Bill as tight as possible. 1091  
3 We have every safeguard that we could think of in here. I  
4 think it's a decent Bill and I would urge for a concurrence at 1092  
5 this time." 1093

6 Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Gentleman's motion that the 1094  
7 House concur in Senate Amendment 1, to House Bill 608. Those 1095  
8 in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who 1096  
9 wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 1097  
10 there's 102 'aye' and 36 'no' and the House does concur in 1098  
11 Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 681(sic). On the Order of  
12 Concurrence, House Bill 1541. Representative Wikoff is 1099  
13 recognized. Representative Collins pay attention please." 1101

14 Wikoff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would move that the House 1102  
15 nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1541." 1104

16 Speaker Redmond: "Is that the motion you put before us Sir?" 1106

17 Wikoff: "Nonconcur." 1108

18 Speaker Redmond: "I say, is this the same motion that you put 1109  
19 before?" 1110

20 Wikoff: "No." 1112

21 Speaker Redmond: "You changed your motion after discussion of... 1113  
22 Representative Getty, is that correct?" 1115

23 Wikoff: "Changed the motion. That's right. First motion was to 1116  
24 concur and this is to nonconcur." 1118

25 Speaker Redmond: "Any comment Representative Collins. The question 1119  
26 is on the Gentleman's motion that the House nonconcur in Senate 1120  
27 Amendment 1 to House Bill 1541. Those in favor say 'aye' 1121  
28 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carries. The 1122  
29 House nonconcur. House Bills Third Reading, on page 2. 47. 1123  
30 Representative Kelly." 1124

31 Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 47. A Bill for An Act to amend the 1125  
32 Illinois Abortion Law of 1975. Third Reading of the Bill." 1127

33 Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record." 1129

34 Speaker Bradley: "Senate Bill 80. Out of the record. 154, Mr. Katz. 1130  
35 Do you want that out of the record, Mr. Katz? 154. Out of the 1131  
36 record, requests the Sponsor. Mr. McClain. Senate Bill 257." 1132

1 McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1134  
2 Senate Bill 257 is a Bill that was similar to what we passed 1135  
3 out of the House previously. It's the coyote Bill which now 1136  
4 has limitations put on it pursuant to Bus Yourell's Amendment, 1137  
5 which is more restrictive than the open season on coyote's 1138  
6 previously made. There is no bounty on the Amendment. It was  
7 defeated drastically. You're very familiar with the issue, 1139  
8 similar now to Mr. Watson's Bill that passed out of here 1140  
9 easily. And I'd ask for an 'aye' vote." 1141

10 Speaker Bradley: "Read the Bill a third time please." 1143

11 Clerk Leone: "Representative Bradley in the chair. A Bill for An Act 1144  
12 to amend the Game Code. Third Reading of the Bill." 1146

13 Speaker Bradley: "All right, is there any discussion? Hearing none, 1147  
14 the question is shall this Bill pass. All in favor signify by 1148  
15 voting 'aye', oppose by voting 'no'. Gentleman from DuPage, 1149  
16 Mr. Schneider." 1150

17 Schneider: "Mike ah, the restriction is not by the department? Is 1151  
18 that right? Okay and then the bounty thing never made it 1152  
19 right? You have the record for that one? Okay." 1154

20 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Dunn would you press 1155  
21 my button green please? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk 1156  
22 will take the record. On this question there are 135 'ayes', 1157  
23 12 'nays' and six voting 'present'. The Bill having received 1158  
24 the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 375. 1159  
25 Mr. Stuffle. Senate Bill 501. Mr. McClain. Do you want the 1160  
26 Bill read? Read the Bill a third time." 1161

27 Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 501. A Bill for An Act to amend sections 1162  
28 of The School Code. Third Reading of the Bill." 1164

29 Speaker Bradley: "Yeah, the Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain." 1166

30 McClain: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 116  
31 Senate Bill 501 now with the Senate Amendments is a pretty 116  
32 watered down Bill. As most of you are familiar, for years I've 116  
33 advocated strongly a minimum salary for teacher's in the State 117  
34 of Illinois, with increments. This Bill now, is reduced 117  
35 substantially. It has no increments and we lowered the minimum 117  
36 salary for teacher's. The current minimum for nondegree

1 instructors is \$6,000 for BA to \$6,800 and for MA beginning 1173  
 2 \$7,300. This piece of legislation now increases the nondegree 1174  
 3 to \$9,000, the BA which effects 16 teacher's by the way, the BA 1175  
 4 from \$6,800 to \$10,000 and the MA's from \$7,300 to \$11,000, 1176  
 5 which now effects close to around 3,000 teacher's. When the  
 6 Bill was originally introduced it had a fiscal impact of around 1177  
 7 thirty million dollars. We've watered this piece of 1178  
 8 legislation down so significantly that now the cost to the 1179  
 9 state is about 1.6 million dollars total. The \$6,800 bachelor  
 10 degree minimum salary established in 1971, today has the 1180  
 11 purchasing power of \$3,257, compared to what it was previously 1181  
 12 in 1960 ah 1971. In actuality I think it's pretty sad nowadays 1182  
 13 when beginning teacher's, the ones that are responsible to 1183  
 14 teach our kids, to teach them government, responsibility,  
 15 education... educating them on health care and everything, 1184  
 16 that we have these kinds of figures for minimum salaries. And 1185  
 17 because of that, I believe sincerely that this Bill ought to 1186  
 18 receive our overwhelming support. One of the issues that was 1187  
 19 brought up in Committee was Representative Birchler and he was  
 20 embarrassed to vote for the piece of legislation because it did 1188  
 21 not have the increments. Frankly, I don't like presenting this 1189  
 22 piece to you without the increments, but I know what's passable 1190  
 23 and what's not and the increments are just not passable. There 1191  
 24 was no oral testimony given in Committee against this Bill, 1192  
 25 like usual Bills that I've had on minimum salary. And I'd ask  
 26 for an 'aye' vote, and of course I'd be glad to answer any 1193  
 27 question." 1194

28 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber." 1196

29 Leinenweber: "Yeah, I have a question. Representative McClain, if 1197  
 30 the Governor sees fit to sign one of the myriad of Bills that 1198  
 31 we've sent to his desk or in the process of sending to his desk 1199  
 32 requiring that the state pay the cost, the incremental cost of 1200  
 33 all state mandated programs, what would be the cost to the 1201  
 34 state to carry out the terms of Senate Bill 501?" 1202

35 McClain: "Mr. Leinenweber, the fiscal cost is 1.6 million. So if 1203  
 36 this would be determined to be a mandated program, which I 1204

1 would challenge you that this is no program, the fiscal impact 1205  
 2 is 1.6 million." 1206

3 Leinenweber: "Well have you ever seen Representative Yourell's Bill 1207  
 4 on the mandated programs, and I can tell you that if you looked 1208  
 5 at it you'll find out that this is precisely what we're talking 1209  
 6 about. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Speaker, just 1210  
 7 briefly on the Bill. We always seem to be talking out of two 1211  
 8 sides of our mouths. I happen to oppose the Bills requiring 1212  
 9 the state to take over the mandated costs of what we do down 1213  
 10 here. Not because I oppose in principal the idea that we 1214  
 11 shouldn't mandate the local government programs and laws which 1214  
 12 will significantly increase costs of the local government 1215  
 13 carrying out these programs and these laws. I do happen to 1216  
 14 believe, and we have been relatively careful in recent years, 1217  
 15 at least since I've been down here, of trying to avoid where 1218  
 16 possible passing these types of laws. But on one hand, we make 1219  
 17 great headlines about what we're doing down here, about how 1220  
 18 we're trying to relieve local government of the state mandated 1221  
 19 cost. On the other hand we put forth Bills like this and I 1221  
 20 have, ah there's no doubt in my mind that this Bill will sail 1222  
 21 out of here with probably the same vote as Representative 1223  
 22 Yourell's Bill sailed out of here. But that doesn't make it 1224  
 23 right, Ladies and Gentlemen and Members of the House. I think 1225  
 24 that if there is, ever is anything consistent, that we are 1225  
 25 going to be, continue to be inconsistent on the one hand 1226  
 26 mandating programs, on the other hand passing laws which say 1227  
 27 that we shouldn't mandate programs. So for those reasons and 1228  
 28 many others I would urge a 'no' vote." 1229

29 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten." 1231

30 Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I 1232  
 31 rise in opposition to Senate Bill 501. The major reason that I 1233  
 32 rise in opposition, is that the market is generally the final 1234  
 33 test for whether minimum salaries or maximum salaries are 1235  
 34 adequate. The market today in school teacher's is such that 1236  
 35 the demand, that the supply is greater than the demand.  
 36 Teacher's coming out of school are willing to take the jobs at 1237



1 the minimum salary because they figure that that in their mind 1238  
 2 is a valued judgment that is worth while. To raise the minimum 1239  
 3 salary requirements, as this Bill does, would only continue to 1240  
 4 increase the supply of teacher's while the demand is going 1241  
 5 down. As long as students coming out of school are willing to 1242  
 6 take the jobs at the restrictions that are imposed, there is 1243  
 7 absolutely no need to increase the minimum. It not only forces 1244  
 8 a greater burden on state finances, but will eventually 1245  
 9 increase local property taxes and is not warranted under the 1246  
 10 current market and ah supply and demand of school teacher's. I 1247  
 11 think the Bill is not warranted at this time." 1248

12 Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Hallstrom." 1249

13 Hallstrom: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 1250  
 14 House. Would the Sponsor answer a question please?" 1252

15 Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he'll yield. Mr. McClain." 1254

16 Hallstrom: "Thank you. Representative McClain is this the Bill that 1255  
 17 effects, I think it was in Committee, they said 3,000 teacher's 1256  
 18 within the state?" 1257

19 McClain: "Yes Ma'am, that's what I said and the beginning ah my 1258  
 20 introduction to the Bill. You're absolutely correct." 1260

21 Hallstrom: "Thank you. Then may I speak to the Bill please. I 1261  
 22 checked in my district, legislative district, and there is not 1262  
 23 one school district where a teacher starts less than \$10,500 1263  
 24 for a bachelor's degree. I feel that it's only fair when you 1264  
 25 look back when this this law was made and the fact that the 1265  
 26 Bill now would mean that the teacher would be getting \$3,250. 1266  
 27 I am not a great one for voting for programs that have to do 1267  
 28 with mandating salaries. But I do feel, that we're not, we're 1268  
 29 not starting the mandate, what we're trying to do is to make 1269  
 30 the salaries fair. And I would urge you to support this Bill. 1270  
 31 Thank you." 1270

32 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski." 1272

33 Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question." 1274

34 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The 1275  
 35 question is, shall the main question be put? All in favor 1276  
 36 signify by saying 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Mr. 1277

1 McClain to close." 1278

2 McClain: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of 1279  
 3 the House. I think Mrs. Hallstrom is absolutely correct. I 1280  
 4 don't see how anybody sitting on this House floor, can tell the 1281  
 5 State of Illinois that our teacher's should not be receiving on 1282  
 6 a bachelor's degree for instance, beginning teacher, \$10,000 1283  
 7 beginning salary. Now I think for those of us that are sitting 1284  
 8 here making our salaries and some of us have other jobs, for us 1285  
 9 to say that those teacher's that are teaching our kids quality 1286  
 10 education throughout the State of Illinois, that \$10,000 is not 1287  
 11 enough money, is a bunch of 'hooley'. Now we ought to look at 1288  
 12 this program as a program to either we raise the minimum on 1289  
 13 these kind of teacher's throughout the State of Illinois, or no 1290  
 14 one is going to raise them. Now I think it's ludicrous for us 1291  
 15 to say that the market is so full now, that people are looking 1292  
 16 for teaching positions so we can buy them out at \$6,800 or 1293  
 17 \$6,600. What we ought to be concerned about in the State of 1294  
 18 Illinois, I believe is a policy, is to provide them with a 1295  
 19 minimum salary where they can survive. And my God, that's all 1296  
 20 they can do, starting out at \$10,000 with a bachelor's degree, 1297  
 21 is survive. And I'd ask for a favorable vote." 1298

22 Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in 1299  
 23 favor signify by voting 'aye', oppose by voting 'no'. The 1300  
 24 Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman to explain his vote." 1301

25 Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen 1302  
 26 of the House. I rise in opposition to this Bill, not because I 1303  
 27 don't think teacher's deserve a salary of this level, but 1304  
 28 because the only people that are going to pay for this in the 1305  
 29 districts where these teacher's are, are the teacher's who are 1306  
 30 there. There is no one else to pay for this. The salaries, 1307  
 31 the ah budgets are already set, the teacher's are already hired 1308  
 32 for the coming year and there's no one to pay for this but the 1309  
 33 teacher's themselves. And for that reason I'm opposed to this 1310  
 34 program." 1311

35 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Wayne, 1312  
 36 Mr. Robbins to explain his vote." 1313

1 Robbins: "As you know, I had an Amendment on this Bill to lower this 1313  
 2 and I am glad to hear that there isn't any increment to this 1314  
 3 Bill that no longer are they rewarded for increases or for 1315  
 4 competency or for staying with schools, I can't believe that 1316  
 5 this is correct. I think teacher's as they work up, should 1317  
 6 receive more money. I think a minimum should be... this Bill  
 7 should be defeated to allow the teacher's to bargain and 1318  
 8 collect what they feel like they should get. The other side of 1319  
 9 the aisle seems to think that they should do that and yet they 1320  
 10 have lost their confidence in the people that serve on the 1321  
 11 school board, that think that they are not willing to pay what  
 12 is proper. Now our schools don't pay this at the present time, 1322  
 13 that I live in and we have a tax rate of 1.50 in order for ah 1323  
 14 the grade school in order to try to pay for education. Now if 1324  
 15 this Bill goes through, our district is going to have to cut 1325  
 16 the teacher's, because voters aren't going to go above a 1.50 1326  
 17 and most of your districts only pay 92 where they are single 1327  
 18 districts. They are going to cut the teacher's. Now I would  
 19 like for someone to tell me whose job... whose job they feel 1328  
 20 like they're cutting out." 1329

21 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from 1330  
 22 Randolph, Mr. Birchler to explain his vote." 1332

23 Birchler: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. No one can say that a person that 1333  
 24 has worked four years to get their bachelor's degree is being 1334  
 25 overpaid with a starting pay of \$10,000. We have those in the 1335  
 26 crafts and trades that all they have to carry is a lunch bucket 1336  
 27 and they work through the working season of the year and can 1337  
 28 make \$15,000 to \$20,000 a year from that 'goal'. I support 1338  
 29 this particular Bill and hope that in the near future we come  
 30 back to increase the increments so we can compensate for those 1339  
 31 that spend 10 to 15 years in a profession as a teacher they can 1340  
 32 get more pay. I favor this Bill." 1341

3 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 1342

4 Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 133 1343  
 5 'ayes', 29 'nays', 3 voting 'present'. The Bill having 1344  
 6 received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1345

1 Senate Bill 574. Mr. Terzich. Senate Bill 575. Read the 1346  
 2 Bill." 1347

3 Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 575. A Bill for An Act making 1348  
 4 appropriations for the expenses of the Department of 1349  
 5 Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill." 1350

6 Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey." 1352

7 Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This 1353  
 8 is the appropriation Bill for the Department of Corrections. 1354  
 9 The other day when it was called to the floor, I took it out of 1355  
 10 the record, because of the controversy of the Concordia move 1356  
 11 proposed. I would like to say to you at this point in time 1357  
 12 that I've spent the last few days starting all over with this 1358  
 13 move and the proposals that are before the House. I toured the 1359  
 14 facilities at Concordia. I'm not an authority, but I have...I 1360  
 15 can see, and I can judge a little bit. The asking price that 1361  
 16 Concordia has of four million dollars, in my estimation, is 1362  
 17 certainly not out of line for the value of the property. I, 1362  
 18 also, went back to the beginning. I read, and it says the 1363  
 19 agreement between Concordia and New Frontiers...I find that 1364  
 20 they do have an agreement. It's substantiated by a letter from 1365  
 21 Concordia. I have it here. This letter is written at the 1366  
 22 request and direction of Mr. Dr. Norman 'Sells', who confirmed 1367  
 23 that since September 26, 1978, the Lutheran Church Synod and 1367  
 24 Mr. William Cellini of Springfield have had a written 1368  
 25 agreement. A part of which gives Mr. Cellini an option to 1369  
 26 develop and purchase the Springfield Concordia Seminary 1370  
 27 property for four million dollars. I read the agreement 1371  
 28 between Mr. Cellini and Concordia... I found not one single 1372  
 29 thing wrong with it. He has the option. You cannot deny that. 1373  
 30 The property cannot be purchased directly. It must go through 1373  
 31 him. The value is appraised and priced by Concordia. I find 1374  
 32 nothing wrong with that. I read the agreement proposed between 1375  
 33 the State of Illinois and Mr. Cellini on the lease option to 1376  
 34 purchase. I find nothing wrong with that agreement. I think 1377  
 35 what we have is a philosophical disagreement among us, as to 1377  
 36 whether the State of Illinois should purchase property or rent 1378

1 property, and that's going to be a controversial issue, and an 1379  
2 issue that we are in disagreement with all along the line. I 1380  
3 know that in LaSalle County, that if the six thousand acres 1381  
4 that are owned by the Department of Conservation today were  
5 leased, the taxpayers in LaSalle County would be considerably 1382  
6 better off. One thing about the lease contract, it gives the 1383  
7 state the option to buy a ninety day's notice. I see nothing 1384  
8 wrong with the renovation figure. There is no doubt in my 1385  
9 mind, and I think many of you would agree that renovation and 1386  
10 improvements from a negotiated status can be done at much less  
11 expense than a contracted status. I think we're all aware of 1387  
12 what it means to deal with the State of Illinois on contracts, 1388  
13 so I'm suggesting to you the need is great in the Department of 1389  
14 Corrections. We have a real serious problem with trying to 1390  
15 stamp the correctional institutions. It is totally unfair to 1391  
16 try to put personnel in the institutions without proper 1392  
17 training. We are not not training our personnel properly. 1393  
18 They have no means of defense. They are allowed no means of 1394  
19 defense as correctional officers. They need this training, and  
20 this facility will offer that opportunity. It also can be used 1395  
21 by other departments of the State of Illinois, being centrally 1396  
22 located here in Springfield, where I think it really should be, 1397  
23 and I'm standing here before you telling you that I have gone 1398  
24 back through all the agreements. I can't find anyplace where 1399  
25 anybody is ripping off the State of Illinois, and I would ask  
26 your votes, 'aye', on this budget request." 1401

27 Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. 1402  
28 Schraeder." 1403

29 Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Let me reiterate 1404  
30 what I said in previous discussion on debate on the Amendments 1405  
31 to this Bill. This is not a question of whether or not the 1406  
32 Department of Corrections needs a type of training facility 1407  
33 that they're advocating. It's a question of cost to the 1408  
34 taxpayers of the State of Illinois, and whether or not there 1409  
35 are additional, or existing, facilities owned by the State of 1410  
36 Illinois that would suffice and do the same kind of job that's 1411

1 being proposed in this appropriation. Let me say to you that 1411  
2 there are, and throughout the state, existing state-owned 1412  
3 facilities that can be renovated at, at least or no more than, 1414  
4 half the cost proposed by this piece of legislation. We have 1415  
5 some at Alton. We have some in Moline. We have some at  
6 Bloomington. Throughout the State of Illinois, there exists 1416  
7 facilities that are available for this type of thing. Now, the 1417  
8 Sponsor would lead you to believe that this is the only 1418  
9 suitable one, and that the Department has to have this 1419  
10 immediately. Where were they two and three years ago when they  
11 had a facility in the northern Illinois area, where they were 1420  
12 training the correctional institution guards? That facility is 1421  
13 still there. They can still use it until the necessary 1422  
14 renovations can be made in these other institutions, at a great 1423  
15 savings to the taxpayer. And why didn't the State of Illinois  
16 go direct to Concordia? I think we've been given a story 1424  
17 there, and I don't want to get into that. That's 1425  
18 insignificant, as far as I'm concerned, at this point. The 1426  
19 question is, 'What is the most economical to the State of 1427  
20 Illinois and, yet, do the best job available for the  
21 citizens?', and I would just say to you, that I think we ought 1428  
22 to withhold our votes on this, vote a yellow vote, at least a 1429  
23 yellow vote, take it back to the Department, and remove that 1430  
24 obnoxious lease provision, and then let us negotiate with the 1431  
25 State of Illinois, between the State of Illinois, for the  
26 taxpayers, and I would urge a yellow vote." 1433

27 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff." 1435

28 Neff: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of 1436  
29 the House. I'm going to oppose this legislation, not because I 1437  
30 want to oppose it, and no criticism on the Sponsor of the Bill, 1438  
31 but I think that we are definitely making a mistake the way 1439  
32 this particular Bill has been handled, and, in particular, with 1440  
33 the purchase of the Concordia College. Now, I'm familiar with 1441  
34 Concordia College. I think it's a coll...the buildings out 1442  
35 there are satisfactory to the State of Illinois, and, in my  
36 personal opinion, I think the state, probably, should have this 1443

1 property. But, also, I think that the...and I certainly don't 1444  
 2 oppose the state buying or leasing the property, and I think 1445  
 3 either one could be done, although I know there's been 1446  
 4 contracts drawn up, but I've never seen any contracts yet drawn  
 5 up that couldn't be replaced. I, personally, feel the state 1447  
 6 could save a lot of money on this particular Concordia College 1448  
 7 if they go directly on it, and you know the state's tried 1449  
 8 to...the Concordia College has been after the state for three 1450  
 9 years. I am familiar with that college. I have been for quite 1451  
 10 a few years, going back twenty-five or thirty years ago, and  
 11 the Concordia College has tried to sell this to the state for 1453  
 12 three years, and I'm not criticizing the man that's making the 1454  
 13 deal. I think he's a businessman, and I think he shouldn't 1455  
 14 have any criticism, but I do think the State of Illinois  
 15 should be criticized for not trying to go direct, and either 1456  
 16 lease this property or purchase the property, and not have a 1457  
 17 middleman in there. I think we've got to look at the taxpayers 1458  
 18 on this. I think we can save some money for the taxpayers, 1459  
 19 and, therefore, I would hope we would defeat the Bill as it now  
 20 stands. We know that we can... we'll pass the Bill later on, 1460  
 21 but I'd like to see an Amendment put on it to give this state 1461  
 22 an opportunity to either purchase or lease this building, 1462  
 23 rather than going through a third person the way they are now, 1463  
 24 so, therefore, I would hope we would vote against this  
 25 legislation that is now presented to us in hopes that we get an 1464  
 26 Amendment on it back on Second Reading, and bring it up for a 1465  
 27 vote, and give the state this opportunity to, possibly, save 1466  
 28 the taxpayers of the State of Illinois some money. Thank you."

29 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman." 1469

30 Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 1470  
 31 House. I'd, first, like to compliment the Sponsor, Mrs. 1471  
 32 Hoxsey, for her efforts to get to the bottom of the Concordia 1472  
 33 controversy, that by complimenting her doesn't necessarily mean 1473  
 34 that I'm going to agree with her, but I do compliment her for 1474  
 35 that. I have a couple of questions, if she'd yield for them?"

36 Speaker Bradley: "She indicates she will." 1477

1 Greiman: "Do you have...did they allow you to take the...a copy of 1478  
2 the contract between the Cellini group and the church? Did 1479  
3 they give you a copy or just let you see it?" 1481  
4 Hoxsey: "Mr. ...Representative, I sat down and read the contract 1482  
5 between parties from the beginning to the end. I did not ask 1483  
6 to take their private files with me." 1485  
7 Greiman: "Well, okay. And, now, you indicated that there is no 1486  
8 expiration date for the option?" 1488  
9 Hoxsey: "I found no expiration date in it." 1490  
10 Greiman: "And did you ask them if there was a time when the option 1491  
11 expired?" 1492  
12 Hoxsey: "Apparently, they did not put this into the contract that 1493  
13 they have got." 1494  
14 Greiman: "Okay. Well, on the Bill, itself, ...Thank you." 1496  
15 Speaker Bradley: "Proceed." 1498  
16 Greiman: "On the Bill, itself. Firstly, they're outside of 1499  
17 the...they're not just not private people. They have become 1500  
18 public people, because they are using a State of Illinois lease 1501  
19 to finance this property. Our transaction is part and parcel 1502  
20 of their transaction. I cannot believe that the church has 1503  
21 given to Mr. Cellini inperpetuity in option, that he will 1504  
22 forever have his mitt on this piece of property. But, what if 1504  
23 the State of Illinois deal doesn't go through? Will he forever 1505  
24 have it? Either the church needs a lawyer, or the State of 1506  
25 Illinois needs a lawyer. Now, I recognize that the Sponsor may 1507  
26 have sat down and read this rather complicated instrument. I 1508  
27 assume it's complicated, because it's a four million dollar 1509  
28 deal, and, yet, Illinois has lots of lawyers. Illinois has 1509  
29 lots of legal talent, and I suspect that those documents should 1510  
30 have been made available, so that we could look at them in the 1511  
31 light of good legal decision making. We don't make four 1512  
32 million dollar deals everyday. I don't make them as a lawyer, 1513  
33 and I don't suspect that the Sponsor has. Now, as far as the 1513  
34 difference in philosophy is concerned in this matter, well, 1514  
35 maybe there is, except I see us paying a million dollars in 1515  
36 real estate taxes over the next five years that we would not 1516



1 have to pay. That means we have increased this rent a million 1517  
2 dollars, because the State of Illinois will paying...be paying  
3 income tax. Now, if you live in Sangamon County, I suppose 1518  
4 that's not a bad deal. A million dollars, the property is now 1519  
5 off the tax roll, we're putting it on, and the State of 1520  
6 Illinois is going to pay a million dollars in real estate 1521  
7 taxes. That makes no sense. No sense at all to me, and I  
8 think that Representative Neff is correct, I think that 1522  
9 Representative Schraeder is correct. There are other state 1523  
10 properties that have not had proper consideration. There may, 1524  
11 indeed, be a piece of property coming to...available in the  
12 Bloomington-Normal area. Perhaps, not, but we will not know 1525  
13 that for a week, and we ought to keep our options open. We 1526  
14 ought to come back here in the fall, and look at this after we 1527  
15 finish this season, after we really see what is available. I 1528  
16 think it will be folly. I think we are doing worse than 910  
17 Michigan. 910 Michigan, nobody knew about. It was done 1529  
18 stealthily, in secret. Here we're doing it in the open. Shame 1530  
19 on us even more, if we pass this Bill in its present condition. 1531  
20 I'm going to vote 'no'." 1532

21 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Wikoff." 1534

22 Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise in 1535  
23 support of this for a couple of reasons. There's been a lot of 1536  
24 comment made that maybe we're rushing into this or something. 1537  
25 Well, I think one thing that has to be taken into 1538  
26 consideration, is we have a new Director of the Department of 1539  
27 Corrections, and I think Members on both sides of the aisle  
28 have complimented him on the efforts that he is trying to 1540  
29 accomplish, and I don't think there's any question, but that 1541  
30 there was a lot that needed to be accomplished. One of the 1542  
31 things is that he's trying to get a training program for the 1543  
32 new guards that we are hiring, and that's what I'd really like  
33 to speak to, because there's been a lot of comments that, well, 1544  
34 we have many other buildings which could be utilized, and I 1545  
35 would not deny that, but we do have a package which is 1546  
36 available to us that can be renovated and put on line at the 1547

1 time that they would like to have it. Now, having worked, 1547  
 2 prior to my coming into the Legislature, with the Capital 1548  
 3 Development Board for a few times as a contractor, I can tell 1549  
 4 you very definitely they are one of the slowest organizations 1550  
 5 to work with. It's going to cost the State of Illinois ten to 1551  
 6 fifteen percent more just because of the problems that they 1552  
 7 create in their front end documents and everything else. Plus,  
 8 they will not even start doing anything on it until the...we 1553  
 9 have purchased the property, if it's even available, and if we 1554  
 10 go the Capital Development route, we're adding probably another 1556  
 11 year to it, and their construction costs have been going up at 1557  
 12 least ten percent per year, and I'm not sure they're going to  
 13 stop at that this year, so, all in all, I think in the long run 1558  
 14 this is going to be a much better bargain for the State of 1559  
 15 Illinois than if we try to go back and take care of our own 1560  
 16 household through one of our own organizations, because, 1561  
 17 believe me, it costs more to work for Capital Development Board  
 18 than it does for private enterprise." 1563

19 Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer." 1565

20 Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I was listening to the 1566  
 21 previous speaker, and if he is correct, that if we must now 1567  
 22 turn away from Capital Development Board to private agencies to 1568  
 23 acquire or build new buildings, I think that we're saying 1569  
 24 something pretty terrible about CDB. If he's right, we'd 1570  
 25 better straighten them out and do something about them. I had  
 26 never thought of that aspect to the argument before. The 1571  
 27 opponents to this Bill, or to this particular purchase of 1572  
 28 Concordia, have given all the pertinent facts about why it's a 1573  
 29 terrible thing to do, and why we should bring this Bill back to 1574  
 30 Second, and take it out before we approve the Correction's 1575  
 31 budget. One other thing I'd like to point out, I am a member  
 32 of one task force. This side of the aisle has been meeting 1577  
 33 very hard. Three task forces trying to grope with the problems  
 34 in three important areas to provide the needs the people have 1578  
 35 to have, and, also, think of the taxpayer, and not spend our 1579  
 36 money foolishly. If the leadership on either side of the aisle 1580

1 supports this Bill as is, what they're saying to me, and what 1581  
 2 they're saying to the people of Illinois, and what they're 1582  
 3 saying to the press, and the press is sure going to notice  
 4 this, is that we're really not sincere. When a deal comes 1583  
 5 along that interests certain people, we're going to go along 1584  
 6 with it. I've been told this Bill is going to sail out. I 1585  
 7 hope it's not true, but if the leadership of my party supports  
 8 this, then that tells me they're in collusion, in a way, with 1586  
 9 this because it's a terrible idea. We have existing facilities 1587  
 10 all over the state that are empty or half empty. We have had 1588  
 11 these reports for over a year, and we continue to ignore them. 1589  
 12 We are now going to go out and buy something for four million 1590  
 13 dollars, maybe it's worth it, but we can get a much better 1591  
 14 bargain by using existing facilities owned by the state. I  
 15 can't believe it's anything but a deal, if this passes, and if 1592  
 16 it's on the part of my leadership, shame on them." 1594

17 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, to..." 1596

18 Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question." 1598

19 Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' 1599

20 All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 1600  
 21 'ayes' have it. The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey, to close 1601  
 22 the debate." 1602

23 Hoxsey: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Other 1603  
 24 speakers would have you believe that the other facilities 1604  
 25 vacant within the State of Illinois have not been properly 1605  
 26 surveyed and looked at for the potential purpose of what we're 1606  
 27 talking about here for Concordia. Well, let me assure you, you 1607  
 28 are wrong. I have worked with the Department of Corrections  
 29 for three years, at least, now. I have correctional 1608  
 30 institutions within my district. I am perfectly well aware 1609  
 31 that the Department of Corrections, in the budget process, has 1610  
 32 been on the short end of the stick for a good many years. The 1611  
 33 training facility that we need today for what we have to face, 1612  
 34 to make up with the inadequate, the correctional facilities of  
 35 the past, is very, very necessary. I see here the potential 1613  
 36 for what we really need here, and centrally located within the 1614

1 state. We must face the problems we have, not only with 1615  
 2 correctional officers, but with counselors, and every other 1616  
 3 personnel within these institutions. We are not providing them  
 4 with the proper training, and unless we do, all the 1617  
 5 institutions will be taken over by the inmates, eventually, 1618  
 6 because you're not going to have anyone willing to work in the 1619  
 7 institutions for any amount of salary. Now, I suggest to you 1620  
 8 that we need this now, at this particular time. I see nothing 1621  
 9 wrong with any portion of it. I see no reason at all why we  
 10 should not support this proposal at this time. The other 1622  
 11 institutions may be able to be used for other purposes within 1623  
 12 the Department of Corrections, but at this time, this is our 1624  
 13 quickest, our best, and our simplest way to get what we need 1625  
 14 for this Department. I ask your favorable support." 1626

15 Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in 1627  
 16 favor signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'no', and the 1628  
 17 Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski, to explain his vote for one 1629  
 18 minute." 1630

19 Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This 1631  
 20 Bill on Corrections came within the purview of the 1632  
 21 Appropriations II Committee, of which I've been a member for 1633  
 22 the last nine years. A lot more time was devoted to it than is 1634  
 23 being devoted on this House floor. The concerns of that 1635  
 24 Committee were echoed, as the concerns on this House floor were  
 25 echoed. We indicated to the new Director, Mr. Gale Franzen, 1636  
 26 that certain judgments were in his bailiwick, and his head was, 1638  
 27 supposedly, on the block in a determination. After reviewing  
 28 all the facts, we understood that everything was 'go' in terms 1639  
 29 of this correction need, and that Bill was voted out of that 1640  
 30 Committee. Now, on the House floor, certain second guessing is 1641  
 31 occurring. I break it down into two categories. One, the 1642  
 32 possibility of some sort of strange situation, because Mr.  
 33 Cellini is involved. That's an emotional reaction. We found 1643  
 34 nothing legal or extralegal that would infer that in Committee. 1644  
 35 Number two, after it was determined that a certain correctional 1645  
 36 facility was connoted, Concordia, then people began to pour in 1646

1 their Amendments on Second Reading, and, understandably so, to  
2 attempt to get that action in their district for proper  
3 re...for understandable reasons. That was a kind of a  
4 Johnny-come-lately Act. We feel, in the Appropriations  
5 Committee, that this appropriation is justified, that the 1  
6 point million 7(sic) dollars that are being put into Concordia  
7 prior to the agreement are an advantage to the state, and I  
8 recommend a 'yes' vote."

9 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, to explain  
10 his vote."

11 Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There have been some inaccurate  
12 facts presented on this floor. One of which is that there is  
13 no option to purchase. I have a copy of the lease right here  
14 that provides an option to purchase every two years until July  
15 1 or June 30, July 1 of 1989. As one whose district includes  
16 correctional institutions, and who has correctional  
17 institutions on the periphery of his district, I'm going to  
18 vote 'yes' for this, because I know the problem we have in  
19 turnover of correctional officers, and I, also, like  
20 Representative Kosinski, sat on the Committee that heard this  
21 Bill, and that Committee, overwhelmingly, defeated Amendments,  
22 which would have taken this particular provision out, and I  
23 think it's because we had the opportunity to question Director  
24 Franzen and get our questions answered satisfactorily. So, I'm  
25 voting 'yes' and urge you to do likewise."

26 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Birchler, to  
27 explain his vote."

28 Birchler: "Mr. Speaker, I just wondered if my light burns up there?  
29 I've had it on for a long time. I wanted to ask questions to  
30 the Sponsor of this Bill, so I'm going to use my time to speak  
31 to the Bill. I agree with Representative Kosinski, and, also,  
32 with Representative Kempiners. I sat on the Committee and  
33 heard the discussion on this particular Bill. I've sat on the  
34 task force, and I visit the prisons in the deal. The thing I  
35 think that is most important, for each of you people that have  
36 buildings in your area that you think fit the needs, are not

1 here in this area where we can move the administration of 1678  
 2 corrections into the building, and put them under one house. I 1679  
 3 live in an area, where we have a correctional institution of 1680  
 4 maximum security with some six hundred employees, and there's a  
 5 week day that I go home, each time I go home, they are lined 1681  
 6 up, the phone rings. What are you people going to do to 1682  
 7 correct or train these recruitments that you're bringing..." 1684

8 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, to explain 1685  
 9 his vote." 1686

10 Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know. I support 1687  
 11 Representative Hoxsey and what she has here, the whole thing 1688  
 12 with this lease, and the building, and everything. I don't 1689  
 13 know of anyone else on the House floor, with the exception of 1690  
 14 myself and, perhaps, each has his own personal situation, where  
 15 they would go out and actually visit and look through a 1691  
 16 situation so thoroughly as she has. She's read the contract. 1692  
 17 We know everything up front. It is nothing compared to the 910 1693  
 18 South Michigan building, which is still, apparently, hung up 1694  
 19 someplace in the U.S. Attorney's Office, and it'll probably 1695  
 20 never get a solution. We know all the ins and outs of this  
 21 one. We've all been...had the opportunity to read it and study 1696  
 22 it very closely and ask all the questions in the world. It's 1697  
 23 gone through Committee. We have the answers. I think even Mr. 1698  
 24 Cellini should be complimented, perhaps, for helping the state 1699  
 25 work out a problem here in..." 1700

26 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 1701  
 27 The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, to explain her vote." 1703

28 Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think what 1704  
 29 disturbs many of us regarding this issue is that it seems clear 1705  
 30 that the Director of the Department has not looked at available 1706  
 31 facilities in terms of their potential for use as a training 1707  
 32 center. Illinois' Soldiers and Sailors Children's Home, which 1708  
 33 a number of us have visited, is a perfect example of a 1709  
 34 facility, which would be far superior to Concordia, is well  
 35 located in the state. It is a fallacy to believe that the 1710  
 36 offices, the central administrative offices of the Department, 1711

1 need to be located under the same roof as these training 1712  
 2 facilities. When we have facilities coming out of our ears 1713  
 3 that are being underused and unused, it doesn't make sense for  
 4 the state to be purchasing someone else's unwanted property." 1714

5 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, 1716  
 6 Mr. Bowman, to explain his vote for one minute." 1718

7 Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1719  
 8 I sat on that same Appropriations Committee, and I'm happy to 1720  
 9 hear that some of my colleagues had their questions answered. 1721  
 10 My questions, certainly, were not answered, and I think more 1722  
 11 questions have been raised here on the floor. We all know that 1723  
 12 OCE Bills, one day, must pass, but what I would recommend would 1724  
 13 be to put this one on Postponed and force that Amendment to 1725  
 14 come off, and then let's vote on the OCE Bill, itself, clean.  
 15 We have some other alternatives that really ought to be 1726  
 16 explored, and I think we ought to force this onto Postponed 1727  
 17 Consideration, and have the Amendment taken off. Thank you." 1728

18 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, to explain 1730  
 19 his vote." 1731

20 Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 1732  
 21 House. I find this very interesting. I doubt very much 1733  
 22 whether each of us in our individual lives would make this same 1734  
 23 kind of decision if we were to be spending our own money. I 1735  
 24 heard it in debate earlier that this was a bargain. Well, I 1736  
 25 kind of equate this bargain to a man whose wife goes shopping  
 26 and says, 'I saved you two hundred dollars, because the dress I 1737  
 27 bought was originally four hundred, and it's marked down to two 1738  
 28 hundred. It's still a few hundred more than what anyone had 1739  
 29 proposed to spend. I think you ought to think about this. 1740  
 30 There are facilities. There's even National Guard facilities,  
 31 I think, that would be available throughout the State of 1741  
 32 Illinois for the same type of training. It's interesting to 1742  
 33 note that the green votes are coming from many of the very 1743  
 34 conservative Members of this House, and I think they should 1744  
 35 rethink their thinking on this, and put it back in Postponed or 1745  
 36 a Conference Committee, and take that Amendment off." 1746

1 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, to explain his 1747  
2 vote." 1748

3 Barnes: "Thank you very...thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and 1749  
4 Members of the House, this issue has been thoroughly, 1750  
5 thoroughly debated. It was thoroughly considered in the 1751  
6 Appropriations II Committee. They have absolutely no reason at 1752  
7 this point in time to hold up this complete funding based on 1753  
8 this one issue involved around this contract in the correction  
9 budget. It has been thoroughly debated. There is no 1754  
10 alternative at this point. I don't see that there will be any 1755  
11 within the next four or five days. There's no reason to hold 1756  
12 up this budget at this time. We should vote this budget out. 1757  
13 If there is something...some adjustment necessary to be made  
14 relative to this issue, we will be back here. You will have 1758  
15 ample time. You have put the Department on notice. I think, 1759  
16 Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that we have a 1760  
17 responsibility here in addition to this one contractual item to 1761  
18 vote out this budget. Then sit down with the Department and  
19 work out any problems related to this..." 1763

20 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain 1764  
21 his vote." 1765

22 Skinner: "I'm not sure there's anything wrong with the deal with 1766  
23 Cellini, but I am sure that we're wasting money here. It would 1767  
24 be cheaper to use any number of other facilities, and the one 1768  
25 thing we haven't gotten yet, as Legislators, is a list of 1769  
26 specifications of what's needed for a training academy. One 1770  
27 would think by Third Reading that one would have that in the 1771  
28 Second House. This is a classic example of allowing the  
29 camel's nose to get under the tent, and knowing full well that 1772  
30 the entire camel will be under the tent next year when we vote 1773  
31 to purchase the property. That's not the way things ought to 1774  
32 be done." 1775

33 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 1776  
34 Mr. Schraeder, I think you spoke in debate. For what purpose 1777  
35 do you rise, Sir?" 1778

36 Schraeder: "No, Mr. Speaker, if this gets enough required number of 1779



1 votes, I want to ask for a verification." 1781

2 Speaker Bradley: "Fine, Sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey. 1782

3 Did you want to explain your vote? Have all voted who wish? 1783

4 The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bopp, to explain his vote." 1785

5 Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I am quite sure that 1786

6 the Department officials here have done an awful lot of study 1787

7 in coming up with this recommendation. The thing that concerns 1788

8 me most about it is that here the state spends a lot of time 1789

9 trying to decide what we really need, when, in fact, we have a 1790

10 number of other programs and other...a lot of sites throughout 1791

11 the state, and we can get rid of them on a matter of a few 1792

12 days, and I think we ought to spend more time on trying to 1793

13 develop proper avenues for disposing of the property that we 1794

14 have before we spend a tremendous amount of time on purchasing 1794

15 new. At least I want for the same amount of time, and that's 1796

16 why I'm voting 'no'." 1796

17 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the 1797

18 record. On this question there are 94 'ayes' and 50 'nays', 1798

19 and Mr. Schraeder has asked for a verification of the 1799

20 affirmative vote. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty." 1800

21 Getty: "Could I have leave to be verified, please?" 1802

22 Speaker Bradley: "Poll the absentees. Put them at...Turn Mr. Getty 1803

23 on." 1804

24 Getty: "May I have leave to be verified, please?" 1806

25 Speaker Bradley: "Yes, you have leave. Poll the absentees, please." 1807

26 Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Beatty. Kozubowski. McGrew. 1809

27 O'Brien. Pierce. Schlickman. Stearney. J.J. Wolf. Sam 1810

28 Wolf. Younge. And Mr. Speaker." 1811

29 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Wolf." 1813

30 Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, would you votè me 'no', please?" 1815

31 Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Call the 1816

32 Affirmative Roll." 1817

33 Clerk Leone: "Poll the affirmative. Abramson. Alexander. E.M. 1818

34 Barnes. Jane Barnes. Bell. Bianco. Birchler. Birkinbine. 1819

35 Bluthardt. Boucek. Bower. Campbell. Capparelli. Capuzi. 1820

36 Catania. Collins. Conti. Daniels. Davis. Dawson. Deuster. 1821

1	DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. Dyer. Epton. Ewing. Farley.	1822
2	Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Friedland. Friedrich. Garmisa.	
3	Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallstrom.	1823
4	Hanahan. Harris. Henry. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Huskey. Johnson.	1824
5	Dave Jones. Kane. Kempiners. Kent. Kosinski. Kucharski.	1825
6	Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Leon. Leverenz.	1826
7	Macdonald. Madigan. Mahar. Margalus. McAuliffe. McBroom.	1827
8	McClain. McCourt. Meyer. Molloy. Oblinger. Peters. Piel.	1828
9	Polk. Pullen. Reed. Reilly. Rigney. Robbins. Ronan.	
10	Ryan. Sandquist. Schisler. Schoeberlein. Stanley. Stuffle.	1829
11	Telcser. Terzich. VanDuyne. Vinson. Watson. White.	1830
12	Wikoff. Williams. Winchester. And Woodyard."	1831
13	Speaker Bradley: "Questions? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Alexander."	1833
14	Alexander: "Mr. Speaker, would you record me as 'present', please?"	1835
15	Speaker Bradley: "Record the Lady as voting 'present'. Mr. Henry."	1836
16	Henry: "Mr. Speaker, would you record my vote as 'present'?"	1839
17	Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Henry as 'present'. The Gentleman from	1840
18	Livingston, Mr. Ewing, for what purpose do you rise?"	1842
19	Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to be verified, please?"	1844
20	Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schraeder, Mr. Ewing wants to be verified. Mr.	1845
21	Wolf, for what purpose do you rise, Sir? Record Mr. Wolf as	1846
22	voting 'aye'. Questions to the Affirmative Roll. Mr.	1847
23	Schraeder."	1848
24	Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, what's the count at the moment?"	1850
25	Speaker Bradley: "Who's hollering? 93 'ayes', 50 'nays'. The	1851
26	Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Grossi."	1853
27	Grossi: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to be verified."	1855
28	Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman have leave? Mr. Grossi. Fine.	1856
29	Questions?"	1857
30	Schraeder: "Abramson. Jane Barnes. Abramson's not here? Is	1858
31	Representative Abramson here?"	1860
32	Speaker Bradley: "Abramson?"	1862
33	Schraeder: "Okay."	1864
34	Speaker Bradley: "Right here."	1866
35	Schraeder: "Jane Barnes?"	1868
36	Speaker Bradley: "She's in her seat."	1870

1	Schraeder: "Representative Bell?"	1872
2	Speaker Bradley: "Bell? He's in his seat."	1874
3	Schraeder: "Representative Bianco?"	1876
4	Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Madigan wishes to be verified. Who were you	1877
5	questioning, Sir?"	1878
6	Schraeder: "Bianco."	1880
7	Speaker Bradley: "Daniels? He's in the aisle."	1882
8	Schraeder: "Okay. Bianco?"	1884
9	Speaker Bradley: "He's in the back of the room."	1886
10	Schraeder: "Capuzi?"	1888
11	Speaker Bradley: "Capuzi is not in his seat. He's in the aisle."	1890
12	Schraeder: "Bluthardt?"	1892
13	Speaker Bradley: "He's in his seat."	1894
14	Schraeder: "Dawson?"	1896
15	Speaker Bradley: "He's in the aisle."	1898
16	Schraeder: "Boucek?"	1900
17	Speaker Bradley: "Boucek's in his seat."	1902
18	Schraeder: "Flinn?"	1904
19	Speaker Bradley: "Flinn? How's the Gentleman recorded?"	1906
20	Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."	1908
21	Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."	1910
22	Schraeder: "Domico?"	1912
23	Speaker Bradley: "Domico? The Gentleman is not in his seat. Is he	1913
24	in the chamber? How's he recorded?"	1915
25	Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."	1917
26	Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."	1919
27	Schraeder: "Representative Laurino?"	1921
28	Speaker Bradley: "Laurino's not in his seat. How's he recorded?"	1923
29	Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."	1925
30	Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."	1927
31	Schraeder: "Catania?"	1929
32	Speaker Bradley: "Catania, Susan? She's not in her seat. She's in	1930
33	the back of the room."	1932
34	Schraeder: "Representative Hanahan?"	1934
35	Speaker Bradley: "Representative Hanahan? He's not in his seat. Is	1935
36	he in the chamber? How's he recorded?"	1937

1	Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."	1939
2	Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."	1941
3	Schraeder: "Kucharski?"	1943
4	Speaker Bradley: "He's in his seat."	1945
5	Schraeder: "Sandquist?"	1947
6	Speaker Bradley: "He's right here in the aisle."	1949
7	Schraeder: "Harris?"	1951
8	Speaker Bradley: "Harris? He's not in his seat. How's he recorded?"	1952
9	Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."	1955
10	Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."	1957
11	Schraeder: "Terzich?"	1959
12	Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his seat. How's he recorded?"	1961
13	Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."	1963
14	Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."	1965
15	Schraeder: "White?"	1967
16	Speaker Bradley: "Who?"	1969
17	Schraeder: "Stuffle?"	1971
18	Speaker Bradley: "Stuffle? Right here."	1973
19	Schraeder: "How about White?"	1975
20	Speaker Bradley: "White? Right here by the door."	1977
21	Schraeder: "Piel?"	1979
22	Speaker Bradley: "Piel? In the back. Way in the back."	1981
23	Schraeder: "Deuster?"	1983
24	Speaker Bradley: "He's in his seat."	1985
25	Schraeder: "Representative Getty?"	1987
26	Speaker Bradley: "You verified Getty."	1989
27	Schraeder: "Representative Epton. I see him. He's there."	1990
28	McAuliffe?"	1991
29	Speaker Bradley: "McAuliffe? Don't see the Gentleman in his seat."	1992
30	How's he recorded?"	1993
31	Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."	1995
32	Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."	1997
33	Schraeder: "All right. What's the count, Mr. Chairman? Speaker?"	1999
34	Speaker Bradley: "There are 86 'ayes' and 50 'nos'. The Gentleman	2000
35	from Cook, Mr. Taylor."	2002
36	Taylor: "How am I recorded?"	2004

1 Speaker Bradley: "How's the Gentleman recorded?" 2006

2 Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'present'." 2008

3 Taylor: "Vote me 'aye'." 2010

4 Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Mr. Bullock, 2011

5 'aye'. Mr. Patrick, 'aye'. Mulcahey." 2013

6 Mulcahey: "No to 'aye'." 2015

7 Speaker Bradley: "Change Mr. Mulcahey from 'no' to 'aye'. We now 2016

8 have 80...90 'ayes'. All right. The Gentleman from Winnebago, 2017

9 Mr. Swanstrom, wants to go from 'no' to 'aye'. All right. The 2018

10 Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ronan, wishes to be recorded from 2019

11 'aye' to 'no'. Now Mr. Dawson wants to be recorded as voting 2020

12 'no'. Got to let this Clerk...we got to let the Clerk get 2021

13 them. All right. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capparelli. 2022

14 Go from 'aye' to 'no', and McClain from 'aye' to 'no'. Now is 2022

15 there anybody else seeking recognition? The Gentleman from 2023

16 DuPage, Mr. Hudson, from 'present' to 'aye'. The Gentleman 2024

17 from Cook, Mr. Matula." 2025

18 Matula: "Mr. Speaker, change my vote from 'present' to 'aye'." 2027

19 Speaker Bradley: "Matula re...goes from 'present' to 'aye'. All 2028

20 right. Now, Mr. Capparelli wants to go from 'no' to 'aye'. 2029

21 Mrs. Alexander wants to be recorded 'aye'. The Gentleman from 2030

22 Cook, Mr. Huff, from 'present' to 'aye'. The Gentleman from 2031

23 Kankakee, Mr. Christensen...Mr. Christensen." 2032

24 Christensen: "Would you correct that to Grundy?" 2034

25 Speaker Bradley: "I thought it was Grundy. It says Kankakee up 2035

26 here." 2036

27 Christensen: "Would you change me from 'no' to 'aye', please?" 2038

28 Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Now Mr. 2039

29 Ronan wants to go back on as voting 'aye', and the Gentleman 2040

30 from Franklin, Mr. Rea, would like to be voted 'aye'. Mr. 2041

31 Dawson, would like to go back from 'no' to 'aye'. The 2042

32 Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, for what purpose do you 2043

33 rise?" 2043

34 Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's indicative that the leaders are 2044

35 back, and we've lost the verification. I withdraw it." 2046

36 Speaker Bradley: "Donovan wishes to go from 'no' to 'aye'. Yes, Mr. 2047

1 Schraeder?" 2048

2 Schraeder: "Toss all the questions if you take the Roll." 2050

3 Speaker Bradley: "We're trying to. Mr. Richmond wishes to be 2051

4 recorded as voting 'aye'. All right. Now, we're going to take 2052

5 another Roll, if it's all right? Okay. All right. Harris 2053

6 wants to go 'aye'. We've got a number of other... Who knows? 2054

7 Only the press know. All right. Now anybody else want to 2055

8 change their vote? Mulcahey, you want to stay where you are? 2056

9 You're satisfied? All right. What's the total? 99 'aye', 46

10 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is 2057

11 hereby declared passed. The Clerk deserves a hand. (Round of 2058

12 applause.) The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich." 2060

13 Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, in the words of John Cullerton, all those 2061

14 charges on Concordia, we've heard all the allegations, but 2062

15 where are all the allegators?" 2063

16 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson." 2065

17 Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side by which 2066

18 Senate Bill 575 passed, I move to reconsider the vote by which 2067

19 it was passed." 2068

20 Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey." 2070

21 Hoxsey: "I move to table that motion." 2072

22 Speaker Bradley: "The question's on the Lady's motion to table. All 2073

23 in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' 2074

24 have it. The Gentleman's motion...The Lady's motion prevails. 2075

25 'The next Bill is Senate Bill 659.'" 2076

26 Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 659. A Bill for An Act to amend sections 2077

27 of the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the 2078

28 Bill." 2079

29 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Hannig." 2081

30 Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate 2082

31 Bill 659 deals with the hazardous waste problem we have here in 2083

32 Illinois. This Bill was heard last Thursday, when I had to 2084

33 take the Bill out of the record to change some wording at the 2085

34 request of the minority spokesman. I believe I explained the 2086

35 Bill adequately at that time. It did come out of the Senate 40 2087

36 to 9. It passed the House Energy Environment and Natural

1 Resources Committee, by a vote of 13 to nothing. 13 to 0. I 2088  
2 would appreciate your favorable support. And I would be happy 2089  
3 to answer any questions." 2090

4 Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Seeing none, the question is, shall 2091  
5 this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', oppose 2092  
6 by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who 2093  
7 wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 2094  
8 are 135 'ayes', 136 'ayes', 14 'nos'. The Bill having received 2095  
9 the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate 2096  
10 Bill 687. Mr. McBroom." 2097

11 Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill..." 2099

12 Speaker Bradley: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 760. Mr. Stuffle? 2100  
13 Out of the record. 762. Mr. Van Duynes? Out of the record. 2101  
14 Senate Bill 906. Mr. Stuffle? 918. Mr. Mulcahey? Senate 2102  
15 Bill 918." 2103

16 Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 918. A Bill for An Act to amend sections 2104  
17 of the Forest Products Transportation Act. Third Reading of 2105  
18 the Bill." 2106

19 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey." 2108

20 Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House 2109  
21 Bill or Senate Bill 918, simply restricts a 24 hour change to 2110  
22 include commercial motor vehicles, which are required to obtain 2111  
23 a certificate from the Illinois Commerce Commission. This 2112  
24 particular Bill is...concerns itself with a problem that the 2113  
25 timber industry has. This would exempt these commercial 2114  
26 vehicles from carrying timber contracts in their vehicles and 2115  
27 require a 24 hour period at which time they are to produce 2116  
28 these particular contracts. And I would move for the 2117  
29 adoption." 2117

30 Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Seeing none. Question is, shall this 2118  
31 Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by 2119  
32 voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from 2120  
33 Hardin, Mr. Winchester to explain his vote." 2121

34 Winchester: "Yeah, thank you for the opportunity to explain the vote. 2122  
35 I was getting ready to ask a question. It was taken care of? 2123  
36 All right ah never mind. Thank you." 2125

1 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 2126  
2 Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On 2127  
3 this question, there are 145 'ayes', 8 'nays'. The Bill having 2128  
4 received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared 2129  
5 passed. 939. Senate Bill 939. Out of the record. 942. Mr. 2133  
6 Vinson? 950. Mr. Taylor? Senate Bill 971, Mr. Taylor. 2131  
7 Senate Bill 1037. Mr. Bowman? Read it a third time." 2132  
8 Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1037. A Bill for An Act to amend the 2133  
9 Retailers' Occupation, Use Service Occupation and Service Use 2134  
10 Tax Acts. Third Reading of the Bill." 2136  
11 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman: " 2138  
12 Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 2139  
13 House. I'd like first of all call to the House's attention, 2140  
14 that House Amendment #3 rewrites the Bill. House Amendment #3, 2141  
15 regrettably, is not in your synopsis and digest at this point, 2142  
16 because we amended it late last week. But it's very short, 2143  
17 it's only a paragraph long and I can give you the essence of it 2144  
18 quite easily, if you don't have it on your desk. The Bill in 2145  
19 its original form would extend the statute of limitations for 2146  
20 prosecuting persons under the Criminal Code, who refuse to pay, 2146  
21 or do not pay their ah the sales tax liability, which was due 2147  
22 and owing. When this question had come up before, with respect 2148  
23 to another Member's Bill, Representative Sandquist's Bill, 2149  
24 Representative Getty objected to that particular provision. 2150  
25 Because, in his view all misdemeanors regardless of the cause 2150  
26 of action, should carry the same statute limitations. Well, 2151  
27 excepting that theory, I proposed amend... proposed and had 2152  
28 adopted Amendment #3, which keeps the present criminal 2153  
29 penalties the same, keeps the present statute of limitations 2154  
30 the same for those criminal penalties. But, in addition, 2154  
31 provides that the state may recover civil damages against a 2155  
32 person who fails to pay taxes that are due and owing to the 2156  
33 state. So that, and now I quote from the Amendment it's very 2157  
34 brief so I beg your indulgence, 'any person that violates any 2158  
35 provision of this section, shall in addition to any criminal 2159  
36 penalties herein provided, be liable for a civil penalty of not 2160



1 to exceed \$10,000, or if applicable, three times of any amount 2161  
 2 due and owing, including interests'. And we give the Attorney 2162  
 3 General the authority to bring actions under this clause here.  
 4 This would provide for an extended statute of limitations for 2163  
 5 the civil penalties, I mean that is to say the civil penalty, 2164  
 6 the statute of limitations is greater than that of the criminal 2165  
 7 penalty, and I think meets the specific intent of the Bill and 2166  
 8 provides us the means of recovering significantly more damages 2167  
 9 from the person than the, than the fines levied for the  
 10 misdemeanor criminal offense. So, I urge the an affirmative 2168  
 11 Roll Call on this Bill." 2169

12 Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. 2170  
 13 Brummer." 2171

14 Brummer: "Does this Bill do anything in its amended form with regard 2172  
 15 to the amount of the, to the classification of the penalty? 2173  
 16 I'm sure you covered that, but I ah it was noisy back here." 2175

17 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Bowman." 2177

18 Bowman: "Ah no, the penalty, the criminal penalty is not touched by 2178  
 19 this Bill. In other words, we're not changing the criminal 2179  
 20 penalty with this Bill. There are other legislation that's 2180  
 21 been on the floor, that does do that. But, my Bill does not 2181  
 22 address itself to the criminal penalty. It provides an 2182  
 23 additional civil recovery." 2183

24 Brummer: "Excuse me, I have one more question. Is that additional 2184  
 25 civil penalty recoverable against the preparer, as well?" 2186

26 Bowman: "The ah...wait. Would you please repeat the question? I'm 2187  
 27 sorry." 2188

28 Brummer: "You said, the Bill provided an additional civil penalty. 2189  
 29 Is that civil penalty applicable to the tax preparer, as well 2190  
 30 as the taxpayer?" 2191

31 Bowman: "That is correct. That is correct." 2193

32 Brummer: "And does that ah, is that applicable only when it is 2194  
 33 knowingly fraudulent on the part of the preparer?" 2196

34 Bowman: "Well..." 2198

35 Brummer: "We've had some situations here, which were, which appeared 2199  
 36 to be absolute liability Bills, in other words, the...there was 2200

1 a criminal offense regardless of whether the tax preparer knew 2201  
 2 that it was fraudulent or not. And that has been the source of 2202  
 3 many objections here. I'm wondering with regard to the civil 2203  
 4 penalty, imposed upon the tax preparer, if that is applicable  
 5 whether the preparer knows that it is fraudulent or not?" 2205

6 Bowman: "The Bill does not rewrite that part of the statute. In 2206  
 7 other words, if this Bill doesn't pass, the tax preparers would 2207  
 8 continue to be liable under the Criminal Code in exactly the 2208  
 9 same way as they are now. If the Bill passes, that criminal 2209  
 10 liability would not be effected. The tax preparers or anybody 2210  
 11 else, who is subject to a criminal penalty, would in addition 2211  
 12 be ah, subject to a possible suit for civil damages. That's 2212  
 13 all. And civil damages on top of the criminal damages, that's  
 14 all does." 2213

15 Brummer: "Thank you." 2215

16 Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative 2216  
 17 Leinenweber." 2217

18 Leinenweber: "Yeah, I just wanted to follow up on that question, so 2218  
 19 that I understand it. What you are saying is, that you are not 2219  
 20 changing the conditions in which the tax preparer would be 2220  
 21 liable, your just providing that he would be subject to a 2221  
 22 possible civil penalty if he was criminally liable. Is that  
 23 correct?" 2222

24 Bowman: "That is correct." 2224

25 Leinenweber: "Thank you." 2226

26 Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty.  
 27 Getty." 2228

28 Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Bill 1037. I think 2229  
 29 that it's a good idea to send to the Governor, an alternative 2230  
 30 to a Bill that we previously acted on. I think this is a very 2231  
 31 rational approach to an addition to the existing criminal 2232  
 32 penalties, to provide for civil recovery and have that penalty 2233  
 33 be three times the amount of loss to the state. I think it 2234  
 34 makes sense, because the standard of proof, is a different  
 35 standard of proof. It would be easier I believe to prosecute a 2236  
 36 civil proceeding and have an effective remedy. And I will 2237

1 support the Bill." 2238

2 Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huskey." 2239

3 Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?" 2242

4 Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will. Proceed." 2244

5 Huskey: "Representative Bowman, what is the existing penalty under 2245  
6 the Criminal Code for this same ah... is it a felony?" 2247

7 Bowman: "The existing penalty in the statute as it is now on the 2248  
8 books, not as we're contemplating legislating in other Bills, 2249  
9 is a Class B misdemeanor." 2250

10 Huskey: "And what is the maximum fine for a Class B misdemeanor?" 2252

11 Bowman: "Well, ah six months in jail is one of the penalties. I 2253  
12 think \$500 maximum." 2254

13 Huskey: "A Class B and six months in jail or a year in jail." 2256

14 Bowman: "Maximum, yes those are the maximums." 2258

15 Huskey: "And now you want to put another Bill...wouldn't you think ah 2259  
16 this Bill, if it passes, is a double jeopardy? You have the 2260  
17 Criminal Code, why don't you increase the Criminal Code, if you 2261  
18 don't feel it's stiff enough and drop the civil? I think it's 2262  
19 putting the taxpayer under a double jeopardy if there is a 2263  
20 fraud proven there." 2264

21 Bowman: "Well ah...Representative Huskey, I believe and that the 2265  
22 attorney's on the floor here, will back me up on this, that 2266  
23 double jeopardy is the concept applicable to criminal law and 2267  
24 we are not creating a situation of double jeopardy here. The 2268  
25 person is simply capable of incurring two different kinds of 2269  
26 penalty for the same offense, in other words, they could 2270  
27 conceivably be prosecuted under the Criminal Code, and go to 2271  
28 jail for six months. But, I might add, as a practical matter, 2272  
29 judges would be very reluctant to impose a jail sentence for 2273  
30 someone who, even though they may have defrauded the state of 2274  
31 several thousands of dollars. What this really does, is to 2275  
32 raise the maximum fine if you will. That's one way of 2276  
33 interpreting it. From a very paltry \$500, to something that 2277  
34 would be much more substantial and much more in keeping with 2278  
35 the nature and severity of the offense. It seems to me, if 2279  
36 someone refused to pay the state tens of thousands of dollars 2280

1 in taxes, it's incredible to me, inconceivable to me, that we 2279  
 2 should not...we should fine them only \$500. We should impose a  
 3 more stiffer financial penalty on them. That's the really what 2280  
 4 this Bill does." 2281

5 Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak against the Bill?" 2283

6 Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed." 2285

7 Huskey: "I feel this is a...I feel it's a double jeopardy, it may not 2286  
 8 be in the eyes of lawyers. This is a good lawyers Bill though. 2287  
 9 It gives the lawyers a chance to sue under the civil penalties. 2288  
 10 But, if your laws are not tight enough, on anyone committing 2289  
 11 fraud on sales tax, then let's stiffen the laws. Let's don't 2290  
 12 make another lawyers Bill to make more law suits available for 2291  
 13 lawyers. That's what's happened to our product liability, 2292  
 14 workmen's compensation, various things of this type...  
 15 Let's...I hope we defeat this Bill with a resounding 'no'. 2293  
 16 It's only another nail in the coffin for small businessmen." 2295

17 Speaker Matijevich: "Before we proceed with Bowman to close, I've 2296  
 18 been told that someone is passing out literature to all the 2297  
 19 Members in violation of the House Rules. So the Pages should 2298  
 20 be aware of that. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative 2299  
 21 Bowman, to close." 2300

22 Bowman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 2301  
 23 House. The Bill in its original form grew out of the 2302  
 24 revelations of the 'Mirage' Scandal and is an attempt to close 2303  
 25 what is a pretty serious loophole in our Revenue Statutes. At 2304  
 26 the present time, people who don't pay their ah the taxes that 2305  
 27 are due and owing to the state, are merely given a slap on the 2306  
 28 wrist. And I think that the fine that a misdemeanor crime 2307  
 29 brings with it, is far too small for anyone who's been ripping 2308  
 30 off the state of tens of thousands of dollars. It seems to me 2309  
 31 that we need civil recovery for damages of that magnitude. And 2310  
 32 it seems to me that this is not hurting the small businessman, 2311  
 33 if the small businessman pays his taxes, he won't get hurt at 2311  
 34 all. This is hurting the rip-off artists and that's the person 2312  
 35 that we really ought to be going after. I'd like to ask for an 2312  
 36 Affirmative Roll Call and ask that Representative Sandquist, 2313

1 who is my Co-sponsor, could be called upon by the chair, to 2314  
 2 explain his vote as we proceed with the Roll Call." 2315

3 Speaker Matijevich: "By the way, I apologize to the Pages. A Member 2316  
 4 was passing out the literatures, which he can do if he hands it 2317  
 5 to you personally, but laying it on your desks, is in violation 2318  
 6 of the Rules. The question is, shall House Bill...ah Senate 2319  
 7 Bill 1037 pass? Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those 2320  
 8 opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, 2321  
 9 Representative Sandquist, to explain his vote." 2322

10 Sandquist: "Yes. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 2323  
 11 I would urge 'aye' votes on this Bill. You'll recall I had a 2324  
 12 similar Bill as this Bill was, before it was amended, which 2325  
 13 increased the criminal penalty. We turned that down, but this 2326  
 14 I think is a way of really enforcing it and making the people 2327  
 15 pay. And I don't think we have to worry about the double 2328  
 16 jeopardy that Representative Huskey talked about. I see we  
 17 have enough votes." 2329

18 Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted...have all voted who wish? The 2330  
 19 Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 142 2331  
 20 'ayes', 10 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1037, 2332  
 21 having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared 2333  
 22 passed. Senate Bill 1227. Pullen. The Lady from...read the 2334  
 23 Bill." 2335

24 Clerk O'Brien: "House (sic) Bill 1277. A Bill for An Act to amend 2336  
 25 Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill." 2338

26 Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen." 2340

27 Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2341  
 28 1277 would establish as the policy of the State of Illinois 2342  
 29 that the Pledge of Allegiance should be recited...would be 2343  
 30 recited in elementary school grades 1 through 6, everyday by 2344  
 31 the pupils attending those grades and at school sporting events 2345  
 32 at elementary schools. There is no penalty involved in the 2346  
 33 Bill, but it would establish this as the policy of the State of  
 34 Illinois. I urge an 'aye' vote." 2348

35 Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Pullen has moved for the passage 2349  
 36 of Senate Bill 1277. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, 2350

1 Representative Mugalian." 2351

2 Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. By this Bill, Ladies and 2352  
 3 Gentlemen, we are being asked to betray the principles of the 2353  
 4 Declaration of Independence. We are being asked to insult the 2354  
 5 memory of Thomas Jefferson, Ben Franklin, Patrick Henry, and 2355  
 6 John Adams. We are being asked to bring contempt upon the 2356  
 7 Illinois Legislature. If we pass this Bill, we will be  
 8 deserving of contempt. We should be ashamed to have this Bill 2357  
 9 come this far, but here it is. A Bill that would be 2358  
 10 unconstitutional, and even if it did not offend our Bill of 2359  
 11 Rights, would be un-American in the real sense of the word. 2360  
 12 Mr. Speaker, we are close to the birthday anniversary of our  
 13 Republic. Have so few Legislators not read the Declaration of 2361  
 14 Independence, or were they brought up on obligatory pledges and 2362  
 15 compulsory rituals that concealed or contradicted the true 2363  
 16 meaning of a Republican form of government? Does anyone doubt 2364  
 17 that what Tom Jefferson would have thought of a mandatory  
 18 pledge imposed upon a people,, who renounced a monarchy? A 2365  
 19 people who declared that government rested upon the consent of 2366  
 20 the governed? But, we impose this pledge upon young children. 2367  
 21 All the worse. The greater the shame. I do not know what the 2368  
 22 school children in Nazi Germany were required to pledge or sing 2369  
 23 or gesture, in addition to the 'Heil Hitler' salute. I do not 2370  
 24 know what an Orwellian America may require a generation from  
 25 now. Our House Rules have already demeaned us. This is enough 2371  
 26 mischief for the entire Session. One does not nurture a free 2373  
 27 people by compelling pledges. One does not teach  
 28 self-government by mindless, mindless repetition of a pledge. 2374  
 29 A free person loses his freedom when he is forced to pledge 2375  
 30 allegiance to anyone or anything or any concept or any symbol. 2376  
 31 Senate Bill 1277 promotes authoritarianism. It's mere  
 32 enactment is authoritarian. Children, it says, you must do 2377  
 33 this in unison, all together, you must stand up, and you must 2378  
 34 take this pledge, every school day for six years. Your State 2379  
 35 Legislature requires you to do this. You say it's a little 2380  
 36 thing; it just takes a few seconds. Oh, yes, in the name of

1 Liberty and Justice for all, you'll require only boys and girls 2381  
 2 from six to twelve years of age, or thereabouts, to perform 2382  
 3 this obligatory act. Why not all residents of the state? 2383  
 4 Everybody? People in nursing homes, hospitals, prisons, 2384  
 5 factories, offices, and shut-ins? You're going to all take  
 6 this pledge seven days a week, so you'll be reminded that you 2385  
 7 live in a free society. This is not a rip-off Bill, in terms 2386  
 8 of taxes or money. The taxpayers can live with it, but, Mr. 2387  
 9 Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, in a deeper sense, it is by far 2388  
 10 the worst bill I've every seen. Its passage will chill the 2389  
 11 hearts of freedom-loving men and women. If one listens  
 12 carefully, one can hear on the pavements of America, the 2390  
 13 cadence of jackboots." 2391

14 Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative 2392  
 15 Johnson." 2393

16 Johnson: "A couple of questions of the Sponsor." 2395

17 Speaker Matijevich: "Indicates..." 2397

18 Johnson: "What...what..." 2399

19 Speaker Matijevich: "...he'll yield." 2401

20 Johnson: "...does this Bill. I know what the intention of the Bill 2402  
 21 is. Is it your legislative intent, in introducing this Bill, 2403  
 22 that all students be required to participate or, simply, that 2404  
 23 the pledge be said everyday by those voluntarily choosing to 2405  
 24 participate in it? For example, if I had a student, and I told 2406  
 25 you, as a teacher or a school administrator, because of my 2407  
 26 religion or whatever that I didn't want my son or daughter to  
 27 participate, what would this Bill do, or what do you intend for 2408  
 28 this Bill to do?" 2409

29 Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Pullen." 2411

30 Pullen: "It is my intent that the Pledge of Allegiance would be 2412  
 31 recited in elementary school everyday. The Bill does not 2413  
 32 include the word 'all' and it does not include a penalty." 2415

33 Johnson: "What if you were in the community, and they have some 2416  
 34 religious sects to whom, you know, giving pledge to a secular 2417  
 35 authority is against your religion? What if you were in a 2418  
 36 community where the vast majority of the people in that 2419

1 particular area were members of that sect, so that you couldn't 2420  
2 have an effective participation? You would just simply...Is 2421  
3 your intention then to allow those students who want to, to  
4 participate? Is that your idea?" 2423

5 Pullen: "It is not my intent that the Bill would be...that the law 2424  
6 would be used as a disciplinary tool as was the case in the 2425  
7 Supreme Court decision. It is the policy of the State of 2426  
8 Illinois under this that the Pledge of Allegiance would be said 2427  
9 in elementary school in grades 1 through 6. There is no 2428  
10 penalty in the Bill." 2429

11 Johnson: "Well, if there's no penalty, what if school districts, 2430  
12 principals, teachers, or whatever, chose not to...not to comply 2431  
13 with the Bill? What's the remedy.?" 2432

14 Pullen: "I think we would have to look at that at the time, Mr. 2433  
15 Johnson." 2434

16 Johnson: "Well, speaking to the Bill. The one thing that 2435  
17 distinguishes this society of ours and our system of government 2436  
18 from the totalitarian countries of the world, is that part of 2437  
19 the parameters of freedom and part of the parameters of a 2438  
20 democracy is the ability and the right not to choose to follow 2439  
21 the mainstream of the current of thought or proclivities of  
22 that democracy and society. I...If I were a student and a 2440  
23 parent, I'd be more than happy and pleased to, either 2441  
24 individually or through my children, participate in the Pledge 2442  
25 of Allegiance. But, I also think that in a system of freedom,  
26 such as we have, that this is an oppressive measure, that it 2443  
27 ought not to be imposed on either school districts, or classes, 2444  
28 or teachers, or students, or parents. I think it's fine if you 2446  
29 could include this as part of the civics class to teach  
30 the...to teach the Pledge of Allegiance and to teach its 2447  
31 meaning, because, quite frankly, it's become, to many people's 2448  
32 mind, kind of a meaningless, rote ceremony. But, to teach its 2449  
33 meaning, and I think that's great, but to require this sort of 2450  
34 participation is, in my mind, something that puts us much in  
35 league with the societies and the forms of government that we 2451  
36 don't have much agreement with, and for that reason, and 2452



1 notwithstanding what I think are the very sincere intentions of 2453  
 2 the Sponsor of this Bill, well-motivated, I would urge a 'no' 2454  
 3 vote." 2455

4 Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative 2456  
 5 Schoeberlein." 2457

6 Schoeberlein: "...previous question." 2459

7 Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Schoeberlein has moved the 2460  
 8 previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be 2461  
 9 put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed, 'nay', 2462  
 10 and the previous question prevails. The Lady from Cook, 2463  
 11 Representative Pullen, to close." 2464

12 Pullen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's interesting that we've had 2465  
 13 the words 'totalitarian' and 'Nazi' thrown around here. You 2466  
 14 know, we do say the Pledge of Allegiance in this chamber 2467  
 15 everyday, and I don't think we hear the jackboots accompanying 2468  
 16 it. I think that it might surprise some Members of this House 2469  
 17 of Representatives, who said the Pledge of Allegiance everyday, 2470  
 18 when they were in elementary school, and I'll bet you that 2471  
 19 ninety-five percent of us did, if not a hundred percent. I 2472  
 20 think it might surprise them to know that the Pledge of 2473  
 21 Allegiance is not being said in elementary school everyday. I 2474  
 22 think it might surprise you to know that your own children do 2475  
 23 not know the Pledge of Allegiance. This is part of our 2476  
 24 citizenship in the United States. It is something that our 2477  
 25 young people should learn, and if they learn it once as part of 2478  
 26 a civics class, how long do you think it will stay with them? 2479  
 27 I think it is a crime that young children in this country will 2480  
 28 grow to adulthood and not even know the simple thing of the 2481  
 29 Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States. What is 2482  
 30 the harm in this Bill? How will it warp our young children to 2483  
 31 learn the Pledge of Allegiance to the United States? How will 2484  
 32 it harm them to learn that there is something greater than just 2485  
 33 their individual sayings, what they want, what they want, 2486  
 34 gimme, gimme, gimme, that they have a country that they belong 2487  
 35 to, and that they should owe allegiance to? I just ask you, 2488  
 36 please, to vote for this Bill. Thank you." 2489

1 Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Pullen has moved for the passage 2488  
2 of Senate Bill 1277. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1277 2489  
3 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed 2490  
4 by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Commander DiPrima, to 2491  
5 explain his vote. DiPrima." 2492

6 DiPrima: "Yeah, let me look and see what happens here. I want to see 2493  
7 how many patriots are in this House." 2494

8 Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed." 2495

9 DiPrima: "Nobody that doesn't vote for this I'll class as an 2496  
10 un-American. That's one of the things that's lacking in our 2497  
11 educational institutions today, is teaching our children 2500  
12 patriotism. Look at all these countries. Japan, Germany, the 2501  
13 OPEC nations. We make them all, and then they turn around and 2502  
14 kick us in the teeth. We got to start standing up for our 2503  
15 rights. We can't be pussyfooting around with these nations. 2504  
16 We got to show them where we stand and quit playing possum with 2505  
17 them. So, let's get a big vote up there and show them that we 2506  
18 want to teach children to learn." 2507

19 Speaker Matijevich: "Your minute's up, Larry. The Gentleman from 2508  
20 Cook, Representative J.J. Wolf, to explain his vote. One 2509  
21 minute." 2510

22 Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. It has been implied that 2511  
23 anybody who would vote against this was un-American. I would 2512  
24 take very strong exception with those remarks. It just seems 2513  
25 to me that making people recite the Pledge of Allegiance at a 2514  
26 ball game is one of the dumbest things I ever heard in my 2515  
27 life." 2516

28 Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Willer, to 2517  
29 explain her vote." 2518

30 Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. How very sad it is that we 2519  
31 equate love of our country with being mandated to pledge 2520  
32 allegiance to the Flag everyday. I was one of those who 2521  
33 objected to it here in the House, because it was forced upon 2522  
34 us, and I did it everyday in school. My children have done it. 2523  
35 I don't know what the Sponsor's talking about. All the 2524  
36 children in my area pledge allegiance to the Flag everyday. 2525

1 It's not forced upon them, however. This changes the whole 2523  
 2 idea completely. From love freely given to love being forced 2524  
 3 to be given. What if we passed a law saying that every husband 2525  
 4 and wife had to say, under penalty of law, 'I love you' 2526  
 5 everyday to each other? Sounds great. You'd be so sick and  
 6 tired of saying it, and so sick and tired of hearing it, 2527  
 7 because it was forced upon you. It's the same way with showing 2528  
 8 your love for your country. Once it's forced upon you by the 2529  
 9 state, you're talking about fatherland, not free people in a  
 10 free so..." 2530

11 Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar, 2531  
 12 to explain his vote. One minute." 2533

13 Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 2534  
 14 I'm going to vote for this, because I don't want to be classed 2535  
 15 as being unpatriotic. But, it just seems to me that we gave 2536  
 16 you the point. We want to wear our patriotism on our sleeve, 2537  
 17 and we don't think about in all other aspects. It seems to me 2538  
 18 this could be done by a Resolution, which might be just as 2539  
 19 effective, or more effective, by making a matter of law." 2540

20 Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz, to 2541  
 21 explain his vote. One minute." 2543

22 Katz: "There are large numbers of children who are members of 2544  
 23 Jehovah's Witnesses. Their parents say to them and the leaders 2545  
 24 of their religion say to them that it violates God's law to 2546  
 25 pledge to anything other than to God. What is to be gained by 2547  
 26 forcing such a child to choose between his religion and his 2548  
 27 parents, on the one hand, and what we say, on the other hand? 2549  
 28 For what possible reason can we torment children? I do not  
 29 mind when the Gentleman suggests that I am unpatriotic if I 2550  
 30 vote against this kind of Bill. But, if you are an 2551  
 31 eight-year-old child in a class, and they say that to you, 2552  
 32 isn't that a little unfair? Can't we handle our patriotism 2553  
 33 without invading the right of people who believe differently? 2554  
 34 If they believe that pledging allegiance in this kind of way 2555  
 35 violates their religion, can't we go along with their religion?  
 36 They can be very good Americans, and I vote 'no'." 2557

1 Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, DuPage, Representative Dyer, 2558  
 2 to explain her vote. One minute." 2560

3 Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, I am voting 'yes' for this, because I don't think 2561  
 4 it will do any, any great harm. However, I think it is ironic 2562  
 5 that, both the Senate Sponsor and the House Sponsor and the 2563  
 6 super patriot who urged us to vote for this, seem to have 2564  
 7 forgotten the final words in saying this by rote, with Liberty 2565  
 8 and Justice for all. Including women." 2566

9 Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock, 2567  
 10 to explain his vote." 2569

11 Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 2570  
 12 House. It is, indeed, ironic that the previous speaker had 2571  
 13 expressed my sentiments entirely. I certainly think there is 2572  
 14 nothing wrong with reciting a verse, but I think the essence of 2573  
 15 reciting that verse must be the belief and the meanings of the 2574  
 16 verse, and I certainly would hope that those who are diligent 2575  
 17 and vigorous in reciting the verse would take time and reflect 2576  
 18 upon its meaning and try and live out the meanings of the 2577  
 19 verse. I, personally, will vote for this Bill, because I 2577  
 20 believe and try and live out the meanings of it, and I hope 2578  
 21 that the Sponsors would do likewise." 2579

22 Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman From Cook, Representative 2580  
 23 Bluthardt. One minute to explain his vote." 2582

24 Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But, I have mixed emotions about 2583  
 25 this, but I think in this day in age when it's almost become 2584  
 26 un-American to be patriotic, that, perhaps, it's about time we 2585  
 27 put the pledge back in. Let's try it. It can do no harm, and 2586  
 28 it might be a good idea, and it might make us realize it's 2587  
 29 great to be an American." 2588

30 Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn. 2589  
 31 One minute to explain his vote." 2591

32 Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 2592  
 33 We could say the Pledge of Allegiance now in the schools if we 2593  
 34 want to, and I probably should be voting 'no', because I've 2594  
 35 tried my best in this General Assembly to avoid voting for 2595  
 36 mandated programs unless there was an accompanying 2596

1 appropriation, and I know the Sponsor of this Bill, the House 2596  
 2 Sponsor, has generally done likewise, and I find it a little 2597  
 3 out of character to mandate this thing without an 2598  
 4 appropriation, and I hope she'll be back to fund the printing 2599  
 5 of booklets and teacher time to memorize the Pledge of  
 6 Allegiance and to teach it to the pupils, so let's follow right 2600  
 7 up here with the appropriation." 2601

8 Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative 2602  
 9 Borchers. One minute to explain his vote." 2604

10 Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House. I have 2605  
 11 grandchildren, and I listen to them, and I talk to them and 2606  
 12 their friends, friends of my great old grandchildren. I am 2607  
 13 well aware that the patriotism and the feeling of loving to 2608  
 14 this country is not as it was when I was a boy. I had to say 2609  
 15 the Pledge of Allegiance for what it was worth when I was in 2610  
 16 school many years ago, and looking at this very House, I really  
 17 wonder and have often wondered if the younger Members of it 2611  
 18 would spring to arms in the same way my generation did if the 2612  
 19 need came, and I question it. I hate to say these things, but 2613  
 20 I think that we will...may be taking a small step back to 2614  
 21 recreating the idea of patriotism in our country and it's badly  
 22 needed. We're sitting ducks for anyone that has a stronger 2615  
 23 will for their country than most of our children today have." 2616

24 Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative 2618  
 25 Schneider. One minute to explain his vote." 2620

26 Schneider: "Thanks, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. First of 2621  
 27 all...first of all, I want to caution Representative Willer 2622  
 28 about giving Representative Pullen any other ideas. 2623  
 29 Representative Pullen does badly on her own, and I don't think 2624  
 30 we ought to encourage her, but, basically, it's very difficult  
 31 to be in the American system, in a democratic system, because 2625  
 32 it does take something more than rote memorization to perform 2626  
 33 in our culture. We would do better to evaluate our citizenship 2627  
 34 questions by evaluating the Constitution. The nuances that are 2628  
 35 involved in Amendment rights are very difficult to deal with. 2629  
 36 This hope that by reciting the pledge in grades 1 through 6 and 2630

1 at sporting events will not do anything toward making a child 2631  
 2 or a growing adult comprehend the complexities of the just the 2632  
 3 basic first ten Amendments, much less questions that relate, 2633  
 4 let's say, to future adoption of Amendments whether they relate  
 5 to equal rights or Washington, D.C. So, I think it's kind of a 2634  
 6 preposterous notion that we're going to resolve the 2635  
 7 difficulties in the..." 2636

8 Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp. 2637  
 9 One minute to explain his vote." 2639

10 Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'm tremendously proud to 2640  
 11 be an American, and I'm...know that some time ago when we got 2641  
 12 this passed in the House, that a lot of people thought it was 2642  
 13 very innocuous and thought it would not be good, but I've 2643  
 14 noticed that a number of people, including people from the 2644  
 15 press, people from the gallery, also say the pledge when we say 2645  
 16 it in the morning, and I think that this shows some indication  
 17 that we can make a beginning to straighten out some of the ways 2646  
 18 of our state and our nation, and I think that this shows some 2647  
 19 degree of backbone that we have in becoming more patriotic, and 2648  
 20 I think this is good. Hopefully, this might extend into the 2649  
 21 area of love, and to try to get rid of greed, dishonesty, and I 2650  
 22 think we, as Americans, can begin to develop these kinds of 2651  
 23 patriotic programs. I want to thank you for supporting this  
 24 Bill." 2652

25 Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Cook...from Cook, Representative 2653  
 26 Bowman. One minute to explain his vote." 2655

27 Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 2656  
 28 House. To explain my 'no' vote, I don't believe this Bill goes 2657  
 29 far enough. I mean we have, not only having a crisis of 2658  
 30 patriotism in this country, but a...but a crisis in the 2659  
 31 American family. Kids don't show enough respect for their 2660  
 32 parents today. I think that this Bill should've been amended  
 33 to require that in the public schools, in addition to saying 2661  
 34 the Pledge of Allegiance everyday in the morning, the kids 2662  
 35 should say, 'M' is for the million things she gave me; 'O' is 2663  
 36 only that she's growing old; 'T' is for the tears she shed to 2664

1 save me; 'H' is for her heart of purest gold. Now, just to 2664  
 2 show you that I have a heart, too, I'm going to cut it off at 2665  
 3 this point. But, I think that it does point up, really, that 2666  
 4 words cannot induce feelings and that we ought to put the 2667  
 5 cart...we ought to put the horse before the cart, and this, 2668  
 6 unfortunately, does it the other way around. Thank you." 2669

7 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from 2670  
 8 Sangamon, Mr. Kane, to explain your vote." 2672

9 Kane: "It's not what we say that's important, it's what we do. I 2673  
 10 remember when I was a kid, people used to tell me, he says, 2674  
 11 'What you do speaks so loud; I can't hear what you're saying.'" 2675

12 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all...Have all voted 2677  
 13 who wish? The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, and your 2678  
 14 light was not flashing up here, so try to turn it on." 2680

15 Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, a few years ago we had a law, which said 2681  
 16 that those on the public payroll had to sign a non-Communist 2682  
 17 oath. We had a number of professors at the University of 2683  
 18 Illinois, who refused to sign it, and I asked them why, and 2684  
 19 they said it was embarrassing. All I say is, 'God, help those 2685  
 20 people who find it embarrassing to sign a loyalty oath to this 2686  
 21 country, or who find it embarrassing to say the Pledge of 2687  
 22 Allegiance.'" 2688

23 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 2689  
 24 The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 125 2690  
 25 'ayes', 30 'nays', 13 voting 'present', and this Bill having 2691  
 26 received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2692  
 27 The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, what purpose do you rise?" 2693

28 Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of an introduction. I 2695  
 29 have standing right here in this center aisle here, the Dean of 2696  
 30 the Chicago City Council, Alderman 'Vito Marzulla'. 2697  
 31 'Our....'." 2698

32 Speaker Bradley: "Senate Bill 1377. The Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. 2699  
 33 Reilly." 2700

34 Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1377. A Bill for An Act to promote..." 2702

35 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich. For what 2703  
 36 purpose do you rise?" 2705

1 Matijeovich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if 'Vito Marzulla' can tell the 2706  
2 students of Harvard a little bit about politics, I think the 2707  
3 least we ought to do, is allow him to say a few words to the 2708  
4 General Assembly." 2709

5 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi." 2711

6 Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker. It'd probably be proper for now, for the Clerk 2712  
7 to read House Resolution 402. House Resolution 402." 2714

8 Speaker Bradley: "You want to read the Resolution 402. Clerk will 2715  
9 read the Resolution." 2717

10 Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 402. Whereas the Honorable 'Vito 2718  
11 Marzullo', the Dean of the House...the Dean of Chicago's City 2719  
12 Council, has served the City of Chicago and the State of 2720  
13 Illinois, in his distinguished public career for over sixty 2721  
14 years and; whereas former Representative Marzullo served as a 2722  
15 Member of the House of Representatives for fourteen years, with 2723  
16 great distinction and; whereas Alderman 'Vito Marzullo' has 2724  
17 served as Alderman of the 25th Ward, of the City of Chicago for 2725  
18 26 years, with great distinction and; whereas the Honorable 2726  
19 'Vito Marzullo' has served the Democratic party for 69 years 2727  
20 and is now the Dean of the 'Active Democrats' in Cook County 2728  
21 and is one of the foremost Democrats in the State of Illinois 2729  
22 and; whereas the Honorable 'Vito Marzullo' has expanded his 2730  
23 remarkable public career, by serving as a lecturer at such 2731  
24 distinguished institutes...institutions of higher education, as 2732  
25 the Chicago Circle Campus of the University of Illinois, 2733  
26 Northwestern University and Harvard University, and is much 2734  
27 sought after as an educator of future generations and; whereas 2735  
28 the Honorable 'Vito Marzullo' first came to this country at the 2736  
29 age of 12, from his native Italy and has become a patriot and 2737  
30 loyal American citizen who has contributed much to his city and 2738  
31 state, as well as to his great nation and; whereas the 2739  
32 Honorable 'Vito Marzullo' has been happily married to his 2740  
33 lovely wife, 'Edith Cozey Marzullo', for 57 years and is the 2741  
34 proud father of six children and the proud grandfather of 18 2742  
35 grandchildren and; whereas the Honorable 'Vito Marzullo' has 2743  
36 been a public leader and a partisan advocate of dedication of 2744



1 integrity and of remarkable consistency over the course of 2740  
 2 seven decades, fighting with pride and honor for the values of 2741  
 3 his constituents and the party, throughout his political career 2742  
 4 and; whereas the Honorable 'Vito Marzullo' has honored this 2743  
 5 House by his presence this day, therefore be it resolved by the 2744  
 6 House of Representatives of the Eighty-first General Assembly 2745  
 7 of the State of Illinois, that this body extends our sincere  
 8 admiration and congratulations to our former colleague on his 2746  
 9 distinguished career and our best wishes to 2747  
 10 his...ah...distinguished American for a long healthy future 2748  
 11 and; be it further resolved that a suitable copy of this  
 12 Preamble and Resolution be presented to the Honorable 'Vito 2749  
 13 Marzullo'." 2750

14 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman...Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Domico." 2752  
 15 Domico "Move the adoption." 2754

16 Anonymous: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I 2755  
 17 proudly move for the adoption of House Resolution 402." 2757

18 Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion, signify by 2758  
 19 saying 'aye', oppose 'no', the 'ayes' have it. 'Vito 2759  
 20 Marzullo'. And the Resolution is adopted." 2761

21 'Marzullo': "I say, Mr. Leader's, more than one and each and everyone 2762  
 22 of you my fellow Legislator's, men and women, young and old, 2763  
 23 it's great to be here today, in the most cosmopolitan state of 2764  
 24 the United States, the State of Illinois. I know I've been 2765  
 25 described in all my past years, but I didn't even know I was 2766  
 26 this old yet, because I took Jack Benny's phrase and I feel I'm 2767  
 27 only 39. But, as long as I've gave all these years I want to 2768  
 28 give you briefly how much I appreciate the life that I have  
 29 been able to lead in this great country of ours every since I 2769  
 30 came from Italy in 1910, when I was twelve years old. I came 2770  
 31 over here, started learning one thing, as my dad use to tell me 2771  
 32 as a kid. In this great world of ours, do good and forget, do 2772  
 33 bad and remember. And this has been my philosophy in public 2773  
 34 life, not only as a Democrat, but as the great citizens of this 2774  
 35 United States and a great public official 14 years in this 2775  
 36 body, and 26 years in the city council. Very....I was thinking

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

when I came from Italy, that I was going to have this great honor, by the American people, by men and women of all walks of life and the friendship that I've enjoyed from Democrats and Republicans and Independents. It was just because I was never an obstructionist in my political life. I always believed in the two party system. I always believed that this country was the greatest country in the world and of course while we may differ politically, but I've got to name second to none. I always said, that if I played cards with my wife, and I'm a pretty good gin player, I want to win. But after the card game at home, she's still my wife. Election day I want to win. No one can serve two masters. But after the election is over, my record will show for the years that I was in the Legislature, 14 years, 10 out of 14, I served under a Republican Governor, but I was never an obstructionist in my life. ....with your party. But 50 or 60 percent may be of any legislative...any legislation come before any legislative body with the federal, state, city. It's not a political matter. Just because the fact that it comes from the Democratic or Republican Governor, Democratic or Republican Mayor, you got to be against it. I said no. And I always had the wonderful understanding with out former late Governor Greene and Governor Stratton. A matter of fact, in the City Council today, I represent the most cosmopolitan ward in the City of Chicago. Believe it or not. I ran 21 times for office, 7 times for the Legislature, 6 times for Ward Committeeman and 8 times as an Alderman of the 25th Ward. 21 times, 20 times no opposition of any kind. And only one time, twelve years ago, when I had a little minor opposition, my opponent was defeated, 15,000 to 1,000. Now Ladies and Gentlemen, this is not just because I'm an intellectual, because I'm not. I'm not a superman or millionaire, because I'm an ordinary layman, But, I take credit for being a good loyal public servant to the people of all walks of life. And that's been my record. That's why when I come over here, Ladies and Gentlemen, I want you to believe me. I never forget this beautiful hall, because this was like

1 a institution of learning to me, when I came here in 1941. And 2806  
 2 I enjoy the friendship of both sides of the House, Democrats 2807  
 3 and Republicans, and the same thing in the Senate. And I'm 2808  
 4 going to keep this heart feeling towards the general public, 2809  
 5 but especially for you young men and women who are coming up in  
 6 public life. I want to tell you, it's just like talking to my 2810  
 7 young family at home, because I have six married children and 2811  
 8 19 grandchildren. And God help them all, I still have a 2812  
 9 reunion once a month or once every two months, to give them a 2813  
 10 lecture. I'm still an oldtimer. So for this reason, I want  
 11 you to feel free, when you come to Chicago, you come to a great 2815  
 12 city. If you call on me for any public service, I'm down there 2816  
 13 five days a week and I'm only as far from any telephone call as 2817  
 14 you want me to be. Don't be worried because your Democrat or 2818  
 15 Republican, because your downstate or Cook County or Chicago.  
 16 Just a great American makes this country strong as it is. God 2819  
 17 bless you all." 2820

18 Speaker Redmond: "On behalf of the full Membership of the House, I 2821  
 19 hereby present a copy of the Resolution to Alderman Marzullo. 2822  
 20 Now that's the official job that I have as Speaker of the House 2823  
 21 and as Democratic Chairman of DuPage County, I have just 2824  
 22 abdicated the Chairmanship and am inviting Ward Committeeman 2825  
 23 Vito Marzullo to come to DuPage County to see if he can't bring  
 24 his enlightened vision to that county and perhaps return it to 2826  
 25 the Democratic fold 15 to 1." 2827

26 Marzullo: "Ladies and Gentlemen I want you to know that I keep all 2828  
 27 these for souvenirs for my entire family. Thank you." 2830

28 Speaker Bradley: "Equal time, Mr. Daniels?" 2832

29 Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we 2833  
 30 would be more than happy to have Alderman Marzullo come to 2834  
 31 DuPage County. We know that he was at a dinner recently where 2835  
 32 we gave special dispensation to allow Democrats to cross over 2836  
 33 into our county line. We would always be welcomed to have him 2837  
 34 join us in the ranks in DuPage County and like all the rest of 2838  
 35 the people that come from Chicago we're certain that we would  
 36 convert him into one of the finest Republican precinct workers 2839

1 in the history of DuPage County. So come and join us 2840  
2 Alderman." 2841

3 Speaker Bradley: "He's declining the invitation. The Gentleman from 2842  
4 Morgan, Mr. Beilly, on 1377. Was it read a third time?" 2844

5 Clerk Leone: "No. Senate Bill 1377. A Bill for An Act to promote 2845  
6 the public health, welfare, and safety of the people of the 2846  
7 State of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill." 2848

8 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Beilly." 2850

9 Reilly: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we spend 2851  
10 a good deal of time on Friday evening and Friday afternoon on 2852  
11 Senate Bill 1377. I will not attempt to reiterate all the 2853  
12 points that were made at that time. It's an important Bill. 2854  
13 Obviously, I support it. I do have to comment on a couple of 2855  
14 things, and I reluctantly do this, because normally I figure 2856  
15 that both sides on an issue ought to make their own strategy, 2857  
16 ought to put out their own sort of information, and then we 2858  
17 ought to take a vote. But, just a few minutes ago on the floor 2859  
18 of this House, many of you received a packet of information, 2859  
19 three pages stapled together. The first one had an article 2860  
20 from the Chicago Defender, supposedly opposing this Bill. The 2861  
21 second page had an article from Crane's Business Review, 2862  
22 supposedly opposing this Bill. Now, if you'll look at the 2863  
23 dates on that first one, you'll see it's March 10th. Three 2863  
24 months ago. Now, let me tell you what's happened since then, 2864  
25 and I'll do it very briefly, but it's very important, because 2865  
26 this is the kind of tactic that we've had to face on this Bill 2866  
27 all the way through, and I don't understand it, and I...I just 2867  
28 don't appreciate it. I don't know why it's happening. Since 2868  
29 that Defender article and since the one by Crane's, a 2868  
30 Committee, an ad hoc Committee of the black caucus Members of 2869  
31 the Senate, the Governor's staff, the Sponsors of the Bill in 2870  
32 the Senate, sat down and rewrote the Bill resulting just this 2871  
33 last week in an editorial in the Chicago Defender saying rights 2872  
34 Bill must pass, and resulting just today in an article in 2873  
35 the...in Crane's Business Review talking favorably about the 2873  
36 Bill and saying the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce supports 2874

1 the Bill. The Illinois State Chamber of Commerce supports the 2875  
2 Bill. You already know that the Illinois Realtors Association 2876  
3 supports the Bill, because they testified in Committee. Now, I 2877  
4 don't pick quarrel with somebody passing something out on the 2878  
5 floor. Of course, that's privilege, but I just ask you to  
6 remember the situation has changed since then. It has changed 2879  
7 dramatically. Both of the publications mentioned in that now 2880  
8 support the Bill. I'll review with you just basically again 2881  
9 this is not just a civil rights Bill. It was supported by the 2882  
10 Cerebral Palsy Association, by the Illinois Retarded Citizens 2883  
11 Association, by the Rehab Facilities Association, and by every 2884  
12 major civil rights group in the State of Illinois. The Bill 2885  
13 basically reorganizes, and makes more efficient, and more 2886  
14 visible, and at a higher budget, the state's activities in this  
15 vital area. Second of all, it streamlines the process, brings 2887  
16 into state law some concepts that businessmen and those who 2888  
17 were afflicted by discrimination previously had to go into 2889  
18 federal court. For those reasons the business community has 2890  
19 come in to support the Bill. For those reasons because  
20 they...they get a resident, the last thing in the world they 2891  
21 want to do is to have to go into federal court to vindicate 2892  
22 their rights. For that reason the black and civil rights 2893  
23 groups of all descriptions have come in to support this Bill. 2894  
24 I could talk for a long time. I'm sure there will be  
25 questions. I will do my best to answer them. My Cosponsor, 2895  
26 Representative Gene Barnes, will close on this after we've had 2896  
27 the discussion and the debate. I do repeat what I said the 2897  
28 other day. We meet here in a historic moment. A lot of us 2898  
29 grew up, or developed, or had a lot of ideas formed during the  
30 very exciting controversial decade, the 1960's. A lot of us 2899  
31 came to have a lot of ideals about a lot of things, including 2900  
32 the fact that American society ought not discriminate against 2901  
33 people on these kinds of bases. We now stand at a point where 2902  
34 we will either have major legislation in this field now as 2903  
35 every group in the State wants us to have, or we may well not  
36 have for decades to come. I would ask for a favorable Roll 2904

1 Call on House Bill...Senate Bill 1377." 2906

2 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jones." 2908

3 Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 2909

4 As most of you no doubt know, the remarks by the previous 2910

5 speaker was alluding to the fact that a certain article was 2911

6 passed out. The Article was not passed out in any manner to 2912

7 influence anyone's vote. The article was passed out is to more 2913

8 or less get at the truth of the honorable men that serve in 2914

9 this Body as well as across the rotunda. The article, in no

10 way, referred to the editorials in the Chicago Defender or the 2915

11 Crane Business Journal. In the...in the Chicago Defender on 2916

12 that date that he was alluding to, an article did appear in 2917

13 that, and the article, it says we then planned for axe black 2918

14 power. And, as...as many of you who participated in the

15 lengthy debate last Friday, you would have thought that the 13 2919

16 black Members in the House were in opposition to civil rights. 2920

17 No bigger lie could ever be told. We are in strong support of 2921

18 civil rights, as we always have been. But, one of the things 2922

19 is this, when we take a position and it was a unanimous 2923

20 position of 21 black, as the article appeared in the Chicago

21 Defender, it said, by Senator Washington, this is a dangerous 2924

22 piece of legislation for the black community, because it is 2925

23 taking 2 blacks out of the key power positions in the top of 2926

24 the administration. Furthermore, the Governor has not even 2927

25 consulted with any black Legislators. This is dangerous. I 2928

26 quote Senator Washington, March 10th. On the next page, if you

27 will turn to the next page, we are talking about the overhaul 2929

28 of the BED, Department of Business and Economic Development. 2930

29 Those were some very strong words that the Governor was charged 2931

30 with now, and I care not to repeat those words on the House 2932

31 floor, but if the Governor was a snake in March, he's a snake

32 today. If you want to go out and pick up the Governor because 2933

33 he's a snake and put him in your pocket and think that he's not 2934

34 a snake, when he turns around and bites you, he will say to 2935

35 you, 'You knew I was a snake when you picked me up.' 2936

36 That's...that's what's on page 2. On page 3, the 13 Members of 2937

1 the House who were opposed to this consolidation originally, 2937  
2 along with the others, is our statement on that fact. We were 2938  
3 all in agreement on this. I didn't pass the article out to 2939  
4 influence your vote, but only to clear the air. Since the 2940  
5 beginning of time, as far as blacks are in this country, we 2941  
6 have been sold out. Yes, we were sold out, but we were sold 2942  
7 out by some of our own people, and at least I can say one 2943  
8 thing. Julius did get 70 pieces of silver for his deed, but 2944  
9 now in inflationary times, I don't know what the other 2944  
10 individuals got, but I know it's far less. Civil rights is 2945  
11 something that I have always supported, but as the articles 2946  
12 pointed out, we were in opposition because key blacks in key 2947  
13 positions that affect minorities were being consolidated into 2947  
14 one agency, and I agree then, and I agree now that to 2948  
15 consolidate this into one agency, to take those individuals out 2949  
16 of the power positions that they are in, is a dem...demonition 2950  
17 of black power in the State of Illinois, as far as the Thompson 2951  
18 administration is concerned. So, for those individuals who 2952  
19 want to castigate us, because we stuck to our promise when we 2953  
20 all took the position that to consolidate these agencies was 2954  
21 bad for the black community, we stand on those points today. I 2955  
22 am not opposed to civil rights. I will support this 2955  
23 legislation, but I want to warn each individual that sitting in 2956  
24 the gallery who came down here in support of something that 2957  
25 they had not read, had no input on, when you find out six 2958  
26 months later, two years from now, what has happened to you, 2959  
27 Emil Jones will be here. But, the ones you jumped in bed with, 2959  
28 the snakes, they will be here, too, and when they bite you, 2960  
29 just remember they were a snake when you jumped in bed with 2961  
30 them." 2962

31 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber." 2964

32 Leinenweber: "Yes, would the Sponsor please yield to some questions?" 2965

33 Speaker Bradley: "He indicated that he would." 2966

34 Leinenweber: "Representative Reilly, I noticed that this Bill is 2969  
35 basically two fold. One is that it establishes certain 2970  
36 policies and makes certain actions illegal for violations of 2971

1 these policies or the...the special laws. And, the second one 2972  
2 is the consolidation which the previous Gentleman just referred 2973  
3 to. Is that the general outline of the Bill?" 2974

4 Reilly: "Yes." 2976

5 Leinenweber: "Now, as far as the...the first part...the first, I 2977  
6 believe, seven Articles, basically that is a restatement of 2978  
7 various other Acts which are currently in the law. Is that 2979  
8 correct?" 2980

9 Reilly: "Yes." 2982

10 Leinenweber: "But there are numerous substantive changes in additions 2983  
11 to those actions which were previously illegal as 2984  
12 discriminatory. Isn't that correct?" 2985

13 Reilly: "Under state law that's correct. Many of the actions that 2986  
14 are...are now made that would go under state law always have 2987  
15 been under federal law." 2988

16 Leinenweber: "All right. Specifically, as I understand it, under the 2989  
17 Senate Bill 1377 it would become an act of illegal 2990  
18 discrimination to discriminate in employment based upon 2991  
19 unfavorable discharge from the services for anything less than 2992  
20 a dishonorable discharge. Is that correct?" 2993

21 Reilly: "Yes, you understand that dishonorable discharges are 2994  
22 exempted from that definition." 2996

23 Leinenweber: "Yes, but unfavorable discharges are now illegal 2997  
24 discrimination. Is that correct?" 2999

25 Reilly: "That is correct." 3001

26 Leinenweber: "On your proposal? Is that...that is a substantive 3002  
27 change from our existing law. Isn't that correct?" 3004

28 Reilly: "No, that is existing law. Representative Barnes, my...my 3005  
29 Cosponsor, previously sponsored legislation dealing with that. 3006  
30 Perhaps, he could respond to that question if you wouldn't 3007  
31 mind." 3008

32 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Leinenweber, are you through?" 3010

33 Leinenweber: "No, Mr. Barnes." 3012

34 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Barnes. Turn Mr. Barnes on." 3014

35 Barnes: "Thank you very...thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In 3015  
36 answer to your question, Representative, that is existing law, 3016



1 and it does not deal, not only does it not deal with 3017  
2 dishonorable discharges, but it does not deal with undesirable 3018  
3 discharges. As it is in the law, it deals with less than 3019  
4 honorable discharges in the general area of general discharges  
5 exempt RE 4, which is under the federal Act undesirable, and it 3020  
6 specifically exempts dishonorable." 3022

7 Leinenweber: "All right. To the original Sponsor I'd like to address 3023  
8 some more questions. Representative Reilly, on page 4, line 1, 3024  
9 religion is defined. As I understand, there was an Amendment, 3025  
10 basically to mean any belief protected by the free exercise 3026  
11 clause of the first Amendment to the United States 3027  
12 Constitution. Is that broad enough to include cults such as  
13 the Moonies? Page 4, lines 1 and 2." 3029

14 Reilly: "Yes, yes. My light was...my speaker was not on. In my 3030  
15 opinion as a Constitutional lawyer, it does not, but I...I 3031  
16 think the proper response to you is if the courts are going to 3032  
17 interpret that cults such as that are included under the 3033  
18 Constitutional protections that'll occur without regard to 3034  
19 whether we pass Senate Bill 1377." 3035

20 Leinenweber: "Well..." 3037

21 Reilly: "It...certainly you do not propose that it be state policy 3038  
22 that we be allowed to discriminate on the basis of race or...I 3039  
23 mean, of religion..." 3040

24 Leinenweber: "Well..." 3042

25 Reilly: "...and all we're saying is that..." 3044

26 Leinenweber: "It occurs to me..." 3046

27 Reilly: "...that that is true." 3048

28 Leinenweber: "...that, inasmuch as if this wasn't so 3049  
29 interpretative..." 3050

30 Reilly: "Furthermore, I'm informed that religion is currently covered 3051  
31 under the FEPC Act. That this definition is not a change from 3052  
32 the current law." 3053

33 Leinenweber: "So, in other words, it's currently the law now that it 3054  
34 would prohibit someone from refusing to sell or rent public 3055  
35 accommodations or residential properties to a religious cult or 3056  
36 members of a religious cult, who would possibly..." 3058

1 Reilly: "No...no, I do not want to leave that impression. I thought 3059  
2 that you were talking about employment. Now, there are other 3060  
3 areas of the law that deal with the subjects you just brought 3061  
4 up, but in terms of employment the FEPC Act already contains a 3062  
5 religion provision." 3063

6 Leinenweber: "All right. What about, though, for rental or for 3064  
7 public accommodations? Would it not be a violation of this law 3065  
8 to refuse to rent a...a room in a residential hotel to a Moonie 3066  
9 or a group of them?" 3067

10 Reilly: "That depends, Representative Leinenweber, on whether the 3068  
11 Supreme Court includes that kind of activity within...in the 3069  
12 ambit of the Bill of Rights' protection of...of religion. But, 3070  
13 again, Representative Leinenweber, I would say that I don't 3071  
14 think...I think we want it to be as it already is in other 3072  
15 areas, state policy that we're not going to discriminate on the 3073  
16 basis of religion. I share the feeling that my seatmate has  
17 that such cults are not properly within the ambit of that 3074  
18 Constitutional prohibition or protection, but if the courts 3075  
19 decide that they are, then the courts are going to make that 3076  
20 finding without regard to whether we pass this Bill or not." 3077

21 Leinenweber: "All right. The Bill also provides, among other things, 3078  
22 that considering someone's marital status would be an illegal 3079  
23 act of discrimination. Is that correct?" 3081

24 Reilly: "Yes." 3083

25 Leinenweber: "All right, and that...and, as I understand it, marital 3084  
26 status is a...is defined as married, single, or divorced. Is 3085  
27 that correct?" 3086

28 Reilly: "Yes." 3088

29 Leinenweber: "Would that include two unmarried adults, female and 3089  
30 male, living together, or two unmarried males, or two unmarried 3090  
31 females, who are homosexuals, living together?" 3092

32 Reilly: "No, it has nothing to do with that at all." 3094

33 Leinenweber: "Well, why would that be excluded from the definition of 3095  
34 marital status of married, single, or divorced?" 3097

35 Reilly: "Probably why it would be excluded, that is those people are 3098  
36 not married, or unmarried, or anything else. It's defined as 3099

1 the legal status of being married, or not married, or divorced, 3100  
2 widowed, whatever. The people you're talking about simply 3101  
3 don't fall into that category at all." 3102

4 Leinenweber: "Well, under this Act the state's...well, what we 3103  
5 previously had was the Public Accommodations Act, which is in 3104  
6 the Chapter 38, Section 13-1, is repealed and is replaced in 3105  
7 your Act under Article 5. Now, you include...well, the Bill 3106  
8 includes as an illegal discriminatory act discriminating in 3107  
9 public accommodations on the...on the basis of marital state.  
10 I would suggest to you that Section 13 of the present criminal 3108  
11 code, the Public Accommodation Act, does not include marital 3109  
12 status. This is a significant substantive change, is it not?" 3110

13 Reilly: "The...just a second, Representative Leinenweber. 3112  
14 Representative Leinenweber, I think within the present law 3113  
15 you're confusing the difference between housing and public 3114  
16 accommodations." 3115

17 Leinenweber: "No, I'm talking about the present Public Accommodation 3116  
18 Act, which is Section 13-1, it's a sequence of the criminal 3117  
19 code. It specifically excludes marital status. It includes 3118  
20 the...some of the other possible areas of discrimination. Sex, 3119  
21 creed, color, etc., but it specifically includes marital 3120  
22 status. Now, I would merely say with regard to that particular  
23 provision, I think that was excluded properly from the existing 3121  
24 law and ought not to be included in this one, because I would 3122  
25 suggest to you that areas of...of public accommodation is a 3123  
26 rather broad...broadly defined term, which includes almost 3124  
27 everything you can consider of that's not absolute strictly 3125  
28 private or is not strictly limited to one sex or one religion.  
29 I would...I would say that it definitely would in...make public 3126  
30 accommodations open to people who reside together who are not 3127  
31 married, either to a homosexual state or a state of 3128  
32 extra-marital situations." 3129

33 Reilly: "Representative Leinenweber, I don't know how to knock 3130  
34 down...how many times we have to knock down the red herring you 3131  
35 keep trying to draw. Obviously, that's an emotional word, and 3132  
36 that's why you're bringing it into the debate. The law refers 3133

1 to the legal status of being married or not married, and, 3134  
 2 therefore, it has nothing whatsoever to do with the kind of 3135  
 3 relationships you're talking about. It simply has  
 4 noth...no...no connection with that at all." 3137

5 Leinenweber: "Well, if two people..." 3139

6 Reilly: "It refers to the legal status." 3141

7 Leinenweber: "Well, if two people come to you to...to rent a hotel 3142  
 8 room, and, as I understand it, if neither of them are married, 3143  
 9 you cannot consider that fact in...in deciding whether or not 3144  
 10 they can rent the room. You must go ahead and rent them..." 3146

11 Reilly: "But that's not to say you can't if that is your desire, 3147  
 12 consider their status as homosexuals or not. It has nothing to 3148  
 13 do with that." 3149

14 Leinenweber: "Well, it has to do with their status of being single." 3150

15 Reilly: "Well, but...but homosexuals are also not a lot of other 3152  
 16 things. I mean, to say that they're not married, and, 3153  
 17 therefore, that somehow...this lets them in is like saying, you 3154  
 18 know, they do also not own Chevrolets, or...or they not do a 3155  
 19 lot of other things. There's simply no relationship, no matter 3156  
 20 how many times you try to make one between that kind of sexual 3157  
 21 orientation and this Bill. We've been very clear on that. 3157  
 22 We've kept that...that aspect of it out despite pressure 3158  
 23 to...to put it in." 3159

24 Leinenweber: "All right. Let me refer you to page 19 of the Bill. 3160  
 25 Lines 2 through 6. It's subparagraph D on the exemptions to 3161  
 26 the Public Accommodations Article. Would you tell me what that 3162  
 27 paragraph means?" 3163

28 Reilly: "What it means is that the fact...someone who is handicapped 3164  
 29 might...forget the Act for the moment. Someone who is 3165  
 30 handicapped, who's in a wheelchair, for example, might raise, 3166  
 31 as an issue of discrimination, the fact that they couldn't get 3167  
 32 into a facility. Either because the doors were too narrow, 3168  
 33 stairways, what have you. What this paragraph is saying is 3169  
 34 that that kind of discrimination, if it is discrimination, is 3169  
 35 not covered under this Act but rather is covered under a 3170  
 36 separate Act already in state law." 3171

1 Leinenweber: "All right. One final..." 3173

2 Reilly: "Facilities for the Handicapped Act." 3175

3 Leinenweber: "One final question on this particular Article. Is 3176

4 it...would you agree that place of public accommodation would 3177

5 be broad enough to include a parking lot? Maybe I can make it 3178

6 rhetorical. I think it is broad enough to do so, and it would 3179

7 appear to me from reading this particular Section that it would 3180

8 be an illegal...an act of illegal discrimination for the owner 3181

9 of a parking lot to refuse to permit those who are not 3181

10 handicapped from using a handicapped only parking place." 3183

11 Reilly: "But, Representative Leinenweber, the handicapped problems 3184

12 are not handled under this Act but rather under the Illinois 3185

13 Handicapped Facilities Act, which is already law." 3187

14 Leinenweber: "Except you include handicapped in this particular 3188

15 provision." 3189

16 Reilly: "But...but we specifically say in the paragraph you just 3190

17 alluded to that their problems, to the extent they exist 3191

18 because of their handicap, are covered under the existing law." 3192

19 Leinenweber: "Okay, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, very briefly 3194

20 on the Bill. Sometime ago we did receive a book titled 3195

21 something along the lines, Have we read the Bill? Well, I read 3196

22 this Bill, and again I don't mean to criticize the structural 3197

23 changes in consolidating everything under a Department of Human 3198

24 Rights. I think that is essentially a good idea. I think we 3199

25 need more consolidation. However, as I tried to point out, I 3199

26 think there are numerous areas of substantive changes in regard 3200

27 to the various civil rights Acts which are currently on the 3201

28 books, which go far beyond what I think the Sponsor intends, 3202

29 but I think within the hands of a bureaucrat either here or in 3203

30 Washington could be interpreted to cause an awful lot of 3204

31 mischief. I would also point out that we are, in my opinion, 3205

32 giving an extreme amount of power to this Department to create 3205

33 red tape for all private businesses who would choose to do 3206

34 business with the state, with our political subdivisions of the 3207

35 state, or with municipal corporations, and I'm talking about 3208

36 the provisions for persons involved in public contracts, which 3209

1 include any business of the state from one employee up. Any 3209  
 2 party to a public contract must comply with the regulations 3210  
 3 which are to be left to the Department to devise as far as 3211  
 4 affirmative action is concerned. Under Section 2-105 every 3212  
 5 party to a public contract must undertake affirmative action,  
 6 must comply with Departments' regulations concerning 3213  
 7 affirmative action, and much...must provide such information as 3214  
 8 the Department may reasonably request. Now, this can be, and 3215  
 9 I'm sure it will be over the years, developed into an 3216  
 10 extraordinarily onerous amount of red tape and filing  
 11 requirements for any small business who wants to do business 3217  
 12 with a municipal corporation or even the state. For example, 3218  
 13 the providers to public aid, those persons who deal with our 3219  
 14 cities, who want to repave our roads, and so forth, and the 3220  
 15 amount of red tape which we are going to be placing upon them  
 16 in order to be able to deal with the subdivisions of this state 3221  
 17 is going to dry up the number of people who are going to be 3222  
 18 willing to do that. We have seen this happening in public aid 3223  
 19 in the area of medical providing, because of delays and 3224  
 20 whatever, in red tape, and trying to get money back. Now, if  
 21 we add another layer of red tape in regard to requiring 3225  
 22 affirmative action plans in the areas of...of requiring 3226  
 23 statistical surveys as to the make-up of the work force as it 3227  
 24 relates to the number of handicapped people employed by a 3228  
 25 particular business, number of people by sex, by race, by  
 26 creed, we're going to make it so onerous that we're not going 3229  
 27 to be able to get people to deal with the State of Illinois or 3230  
 28 the cities. It's with reluctance that I would urge a 'no' vote 3231  
 29 on Senate Bill 1377. Not because of the need for 3232  
 30 reorganization, but for the many substantive changes and the 3233  
 31 many statistical requirements which are going to be brought 3234  
 32 about through the passage of this Act." 3235

33 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock." 3237

34 Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask a couple of 3238  
 35 questions of the Sponsor, if I may. Will the Gentleman yield?" 3239

36 Keilly: "Yes." 3242

1 Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will." 3244

2 Bullock: "Representative Reilly, I think Representative Leinenweber 3245  
3 raised an important point, which I had raised before, but I 3246  
4 would just want, for the record, I want you to clarify. 3247  
5 According to the Illinois Constitution there appears to be 3248  
6 provisions in public employment and accommodation. Is it your 3249  
7 opinion that the State Constitution grant such rights?" 3250

8 Reilly: "Yes." 3252

9 Bullock: "Do you also concur that those rights are covered under both 3253  
10 the United States Federal Constitution?" 3255

11 Reilly: "Yes, but Representative Bullock, the problem is that a 3256  
12 person in one of these situations who feels that their rights, 3257  
13 for whatever reason, are being violated, do not want, need, or 3258  
14 have any use for state or federal constitutional cases which 3259  
15 end up in the Supreme Court. What they need is immediate 3260  
16 relief at administrative level, and that's why we're moving 3261  
17 this legislation as to the extent it deals with those areas." 3262

18 Bullock: "Well, then one more question, Representative Reilly. Is it 3263  
19 your opinion that Senate Bill 1377, in anyway, addresses that 3264  
20 category of rights?" 3265

21 Reilly: "Yes, it greatly strengthens the state's ability, both 3266  
22 administratively and in terms of substantive law to enforce and 3267  
23 carry out the Constitutional guarantees to which you refer. 3268

24 Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the Bill, if I may?" 327

25 Speaker Bradley: "Proceed: " 3272

26 Bullock: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate 327  
27 Bill 1377 does, indeed, limit rights that are already provided 327  
28 under the State Constitution and the Federal Constitution on 327  
29 housing and public accommodation. But, more specifically, 327  
30 Senate Bill 1377 appears to be regressive in the area of civil 327  
31 rights violation as misdemeanors. It, also, appears to 327  
32 eliminate direct access to civil proceedings on the part of 327  
33 complainants. I also think, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 328  
34 that throughout Illinois history we have sort of taken a 328  
35 position that was postulated by a Gentleman that I was 328  
36 fortunate enough to succeed, Representative Corneal Davis and

1 others, as it relates to fair employment practices in this 3283  
 2 state. I see this Bill in many ways being regressive and 3284  
 3 deliberately changing existing state affirmative action 3285  
 4 obligations, I, also, see this Bill increasing de...delay on  
 5 the part of this civil rights agency to expeditiously prosecute 3286  
 6 violations under the law. I think that the Bill would make 3287  
 7 massive and wrenching changes, both in the structure of 3288  
 8 agencies already in place under our Constitution, and I think 3289  
 9 the Bill, in many ways, deliberately deletes existing language  
 10 in the state statutes, so that it would be much more cumbersome 3290  
 11 for persons, victims of willful discrimination, to seek 3291  
 12 redress. Most of the debate on this Bill has been heard in 3292  
 13 prior Sessions, but I would urge Members on both sides of the 3293  
 14 aisle, both liberals and conservatives, moderates, downstate,  
 15 upstate, and suburbia, to take a close look at Senate Bill 3294  
 16 1377, for it does indeed go beyond structural change in state 3295  
 17 government. It does indeed address the subject of equal 3296  
 18 opportunity, equal access, and civil rights under the law, and 3297  
 19 I think that we are, perhaps once again, moving with too much 3298  
 20 dispatch in making a decision on Senate Bill 1377." 3299

21 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel." 3301

22 Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question." 3303

23 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The 3304  
 24 question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor 3305  
 25 signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed, 'no'. Opinion of the Chair, 3306  
 26 the 'ayes' have it, and the motion prevails. The Gentleman 3307  
 27 from Morgan, Mr. Reilly, to close the debate." 3308

28 Reilly: "I would yield to my..." 3310

29 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, to close the 3311  
 30 debate." 3312

31 Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the 3313  
 32 House, I believe that there has been much, much, much debate 3314  
 33 around...surrounding Senate Bill 1377. Unfortunately, much of 3315  
 34 it had absolutely no...nothing whatsoever to do with the merits 3316  
 35 or the demerits of the issue that is presented, embodied within 3317  
 36 the legislation that appears before us currently. I'm going to 3318



1 be very brief in my closing. I believe Representative Reilly 33  
2 have...has illustrated to this General Assembly what is 33  
3 involved relative to Senate Bill 1377, and I think, Mr. Speaker 33  
4 and Members of the House, that in all of the debate that we've 33  
5 heard is that everyone, I think, should have by now either made 33  
6 some determination relative to what they will be doing on this 33  
7 Bill. Let me read you from an editorial in the Chicago Sun  
8 Times, dated June the 20th, in a quote embodied within that 33  
9 editorial from the President of the Urban League. And the 33  
10 Gentleman said the Illinois Human Relations Act raised 33  
11 governmental responsibilities in this area to its necessary 33  
12 level of prominence and accountability, so that it is no longer 33  
13 dispensed and hidden away as a secondary part of other 33  
14 agencies. If nothing else, Mr. Speaker and Members of the 33  
15 House, this legislation presented to you today establishes this 33  
16 fact that was illustrated in that quote from the President of 33  
17 the Urban League up in the City of Chicago. Now, I say to you 33  
18 and to the Members of this House, that presented before you 33  
19 here today is an opportunity for us to act in a positive way 33  
20 relative to an issue that many people have been doing in a 33  
21 patchwork fashion in the last 15 or so years in this state.  
22 Myself being one of those people, but we have an opportunity 33  
23 today to bring under one umbrella all of those various 33  
24 different patch quilt works, pieces of legislation, into one 33  
25 cabinet level responsible agency to, therefore, whatever side 33  
26 of the issue you may be on, whether you are the person who has  
27 felt...feels that they have been grieved or whether you are the 33  
28 person that that person has accru...accused of the grievance. 33  
29 For the first time, with the adoption of this legislation, 33  
30 there will be one central place, one central agency, one 33  
31 structure for those persons to go to to have either their  
32 grievance affirmed or to either have that grievance denied. 33  
33 Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think that the proper time 33  
34 has come for Illinois to move into the 20th century relative to 33  
35 this vital subject. When you consider that all of the midwest 33  
36 states around us, Wisconsin, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, all of 33

1 the states around us, has taken these steps long ago. When you 3348  
 2 consider Minnesota, who has taken this step and is, in essence, 3349  
 3 the same kind of agrarian state that Illinois is, has taken 3350  
 4 this step long ago. I think, Mr. Speaker and Members of the 3351  
 5 House, personality conflicts notwithstanding, we here in this 3352  
 6 Body, I think, is charged with the responsibility of acting on 3353  
 7 the issues, and...and the issues embodied in the legislation  
 8 that...that is presented to us. For whatever reasons, for 3354  
 9 whatever reasons we are elected to this Body, the one most 3355  
 10 prominent reason we are here is to act on a matter presented to 3356  
 11 us, the merits or the demerits of the facts presented to us,  
 12 embodied in legislation that we act on, notwithstanding any 3357  
 13 personal conflicts that any individual or group of individuals 3358  
 14 may have with those people who are involved in the legislation. 3359  
 15 That's the bottom line here, and I would urge...I would 3360  
 16 sincerely urge, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the  
 17 passage of Senate Bill 1377 for the modest step...for the 3361  
 18 modest step that we will be addressing to this area as 3362  
 19 indicated by the Chicago Tribune in a June editorial, the 3363  
 20 modest step, but the modest forward step we will be making in 3364  
 21 this area. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I urge...I  
 22 urge your support on a bipartisan basis to Senate Bill 1377." 3365  
 23 Speaker Bradley: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in 3367  
 24 favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'no'. 3368  
 25 The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins, to explain his vote for 3369  
 26 one minute." 3370  
 27 Robbins: "Thank you for being recognized. I intended to move to 3371  
 28 table this Bill, because of the way the House has...was run 3372  
 29 over last Friday night. There was a number of Amendments put 3373  
 30 on, which we were not allowed to vote on. They were not even 3374  
 31 read. They were read by number, and how can you expect to have 3375  
 32 a civil rights Bill when you run over the civil rights of the 3376  
 33 House to put it on? We should be able to vote on a Bill by the  
 34 way the Amendments are and not have to put...vote on something 3377  
 35 like this. I'm sure it will pass, but I want the people in my 3378  
 36 district to know that I believe in equal rights and civil 3379

1 rights, but I do not believe in taking away the rights of this 3380  
2 House." 3381

3 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff, to explain his 3382  
4 vote for one minute." 3384

5 Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 3385  
6 Very briefly, my reason for voting 'no' against this 3386  
7 measurement is that in contemplating it it reminds me of a 3387  
8 passage from Lewis Carroll's novel, Alice in Wonderland in 3388  
9 which the Duchess told Alice it took all the running you can do  
10 to stay in one place. For, in spite of all the rhetoric, this 3389  
11 so-called sweeping document doesn't seem to be going anywhere 3390  
12 anymore than the Bill that it's supposed to be replacing." 3392

13 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, to explain 3393  
14 his vote." 3394

15 Vinson: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. We 3395  
16 spent several hours the other day on this Bill. We heard 3396  
17 people criticize the Bill, because it didn't go far enough. We 3397  
18 spent quite a bit of time, relatively speaking, this morning on 3398  
19 this Bill, and we've heard criticism of the Bill, because it 3399  
20 supposedly goes too far. Over the weekend I took the time to  
21 read the Bill. I won't claim in great detail, although I did 3400  
22 pay a lot of attention to the open housing Section in the Bill. 3401  
23 In that Section of the Bill, as far as I can tell, nothing new 3402  
24 is made illegal. The Bill simply continues the...the current 3403  
25 prohibitions. Some of the remedies are changed, but there's no 3404  
26 remedy added to the Bill which is not available under current  
27 federal law. What this Bill does is to simply consolidate a 3405  
28 set of agencies, a set of agencies scattered all over state 3406  
29 government today. It brings them together in consolidated form 3407  
30 in one cabinet Department. I think that's a desirable step." 3408

31 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, to explain his 3410  
32 vote for one minute." 3412

33 Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a moderate 3413  
34 measure, because Illinois currently has a number of statutes 3414  
35 which deal with the subject, but the enforcement is different 3415  
36 in each class, the penalties are different, and the protected 3416

1 classes are different. What this does is make it so that 3417  
 2 conscientious citizens, who really don't intend to violate  
 3 civil rights law, are left in a quandary, and they are 3418  
 4 unprotected against unfounded charges of discrimination. The 3419  
 5 people who are grieved are forced to go to federal court. Now, 3420  
 6 it's time that Illinois end its advocacy of responsibility in 3421  
 7 this particular matter and get away from these 11 different  
 8 acts with different coverages, different protections 3422  
 9 throughout. Now, anti-discrimination laws ought to be uniform 3423  
 10 and should protect the individual citizens in a uniform..." 3424

11 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines, to explain his 3425  
 12 vote." 3426

13 Gaines: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 3427  
 14 House. The other evening we took time, but no one heard 3428  
 15 anything. The Amendments that were defeated were not debated, 3429  
 16 and Amendments that were passed were not debated, so I don't 3430  
 17 know what the speaker means when he said it has been fairly 3431  
 18 debated, and I wish to correct the Sponsor of the Bill. All 3432  
 19 the civil rights agencies in this state are not for it. NAACP  
 20 is not on record in favor of it, and I think that's the #1 3433  
 21 black civil rights agency. The Cook County Bar Association is 3434  
 22 not for it. That's the #1 legal protector of black folks, so 3435  
 23 don't say that all are for this Bill. Many have serious 3436  
 24 reservations about this Bill, and that's why I say that when  
 25 you see conscientious black Legislators as severely divided as 3437  
 26 we have been on this issue, I think it's time to take out...the 3438  
 27 time to take...time again to see if we can't make this..." 3439

28 Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun, to explain her 3440  
 29 vote." 3441

30 Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 3442  
 31 There is little doubt that this Bill is an imperfect one. 3443  
 32 Indeed, last week I supported a motion to recommit it to 3444  
 33 Committee, so that it's many defects, technical, typographical, 3445  
 34 and substantive could be cured. I was also distressed that 3446  
 35 this Bill had not had the kind of deliberate, thorough  
 36 attention and scrutiny that is normally given major legislation 3447

1 of this kind. This Body chose not to send the Bill back to 3448  
 2 Committee, and, therefore, undertook to clean it up...clean up 3449  
 3 an otherwise sloppy piece of legislation as a Committee of the 3450  
 4 whole. While I fear that the Bill may yet be an imperfect 3451  
 5 piece of legislation, the action of this Body has put it before 3452  
 6 us today in its present form. It...it is curious that my 3453  
 7 reservations and sentiments of an advocate of civil rights  
 8 reform are now being echoed by those who fear it may go too 3454  
 9 far, but the realities are that this Bill, in a modest way, 3455  
 10 does provide some protections for persons who are injured to 3456  
 11 get redress from state government in a rational way." 3457

12 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Getty, did you wish to explain your vote, Sir?" 3458

13 Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly, I had wanted to 3460  
 14 ask the Sponsor a question to possibly clear up a problem with 3461  
 15 legislative intent. Possibly, he could answer the question in 3462  
 16 his explanation. In Section 2-105B, as the Bill was originally 3463  
 17 introduced, it referred to race, color, religion, national 3464  
 18 origin, ancestry. As the Bill was amended in the Senate, those 3465  
 19 things were deleted to say race, sex, and handicap, and then 3465  
 20 other category as the Department may say. Now, I'm concerned 3466  
 21 that you are setting up what may be determined to be an 3467  
 22 unconstitutional segregation of the items of race, sex, and 3468  
 23 handicap without having religion, national origin, ancestry, 3469  
 24 and so forth..." 3470

25 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, 3471  
 26 Mr. Taylor." 3472

27 Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise on a point of 3473  
 28 personal privilege and, at the same time, explain my vote, 3474  
 29 because I think that my character has been attacked in a 3475  
 30 newspaper, and on...on a program on Sunday morning on that 3476  
 31 issue. I just want this House to know everybody don't have the 3477  
 32 same intelligence to deal with civil rights issues as some of  
 33 you may have. I am not a non-violent individual. I cannot go 3478  
 34 out and let someone put waterhose on me, and I not do what I 3479  
 35 should do. I believe in an eye for an eye and a tooth for a 3480  
 36 tooth. And I will act accordingly in that respect. Here 3481

1 today, as I said the other night, I was looking for an 348  
 2 opportunity to express myself in regard to this piece of 348  
 3 legislation. I felt then that it was bad. I feel today that 348  
 4 it is bad. I know that some deals has been made, regardless to 348  
 5 whom. I know that this is going to be bad for my people. In 348  
 6 the years to come when you read this legislation, it is told 348  
 7 you will find that many of us have made a mistake. But I told 348  
 8 you, and I was glad to see the Dean of the City Council here 348  
 9 today who spoke about his lifehood, and what he has done, and 348  
 10 he does not want to be an obstructionist. I've already pledged 348  
 11 that I will not be an obstructionist either. I will do what is 349  
 12 right as far as this Body, but for the press, and for those 349  
 13 civil rights agencies who feel that Jim Taylor does not stand 349  
 14 up for what is right for black people is a laugh. And this 349  
 15 Bill today is not the best thing for black people, and I want 349  
 16 you to print it that way, because I know. I'm here. I know 349  
 17 what you do on this floor. And I've seen that this Bill was 349  
 18 passed out of this House without a debate. It was passed out 349  
 19 of the Senate, and when you have been here as long as I have,  
 20 a Bill that comes out the that Senate trying to do something 349  
 21 for black folk when you've got white people over in that center 349  
 22 voting some things that are good for black folk, and never in 349  
 23 the history of this state since I have been here...voted for 350  
 24 anything that will affect that was good for black people. 350  
 25 Every little Bill that I have ever sent there, any old Bill,  
 26 just trying to do a little something for the people in this 350  
 27 community that I represent, you've always been against it. 350  
 28 Ain't no way in the world that you can make me believe that you 350  
 29 going to give me a good Bill that's going to be a moral for all 350  
 30 the black people in the State of Illinois. But, Mr. Speaker 350  
 31 and Members of this House, cause I gave my word that I would  
 32 not be an obstructionist, I will vote 'aye' to send this bad 350  
 33 Bill out to the Governor's desk." 350

34 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 351  
 35 Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On 351  
 36 this question there are 137 'ayes', 19 'nos'. This Bill having 351

1 received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3513

2 What purpose does the Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Reilly, rise?" 3514

3 Reilly: "On a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, and I will be 3516

4 very brief, and I don't do this very often. I would appreciate 3517

5 the attention of the House just on a couple of points. First 3518

6 of all to respond to Representative...the question 3519

7 Representative Getty asked, we did not intend, by taking those 3520

8 words out, in any way to decrease the delegation. It's simply 3521

9 talking here in terms of being able to verify, to be able to 3522

10 see those characteristics that were...against which we are 3522

11 prohibiting discrimination. But the real purpose I asked the 3523

12 Speaker to recognize me goes further. The question must 3524

13 inevitably arise is why a white Republican from Central 3525

14 Illinois is House Sponsor of this Bill." 3526

15 Speaker Bradley: "The...the question...What purpose does the 3527

16 Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jones arise?" 3529

17 Jones: "Mr. Speaker, whatever reason the Sponsor sponsors a Bill, 3530

18 that's a matter of record. No one mentioned the previous 3531

19 speaker's name in debate, so there's no need to explain why 3532

20 he's sponsoring the Bill. That's not the point...only why he's 3533

21 rising, and I object to that." 3534

22 Speaker Bradley: "He rose on a point of personal privilege...and 3535

23 would you like to restate your point on rising on the point of 3536

24 personal privilege?" 3537

25 Reilly: "My intention was to explain, and I had asked the indulgence 3538

26 of the House. If I don't have it, that is fine. My purpose 3539

27 was to explain my motives in sponsoring the Bill to commend 3540

28 Representative Barnes as the Co-Sponsor, and to indicate to 3541

29 those who oppose the Bill that it seemed to me that they have 3542

30 done their job, that they have made the good fight, that they 3543

31 have forced us to improve this Bill, and to thank them for 3544

32 their courtesy. If they don't want me to do that, of course, I 3544

33 will withdraw my point of personal privilege." 3546

34 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes." 3548

35 Barnes: "Thank you very..." 3550

36 Speaker Bradley: "What purpose do you rise?" 3552

1 Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Having voted on the 3553  
2 prevailing side, I would move that the vote by which Senate 3554  
3 Bill 1377 passed would be reconsidered." 3556

4 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels." 3558  
5 Daniels: "I move the motion lay on the table." 3560

6 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that lies on the table. All in 3561  
7 favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 3562  
8 'ayes' have it, and that motion is tabled. On Second Reading 3563  
9 appears Senate Bill 1172." 3564

10 Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1172..." 3566

11 Speaker Bradley: "I'm sorry, it's Third Reading, Short Debate." 3568

12 Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1172. A Bill for an Act to amend 3569  
13 sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill." 3571

14 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle." 3573

15 Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to return Senate Bill 3574  
16 1172 to Second Reading for the purposes of tabling an 3575  
17 Amendment." 3576

18 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, we'll 3577  
19 return it to Second Reading. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. 3578  
20 Stuffle, which Amendment?" 3579

21 Stuffle: "Yes, Speaker, I would now move to table House Amendment #3 3580  
22 to Senate Bill 1172. House Amendment #3 was put on by 3581  
23 Representative Hoffman and I. There has been some question 3582  
24 raised about it. This is the school aid formula provisions 3583  
25 that are essentially the same as those that this House 3584  
26 overwhelmingly sent to the Senate. We do not wish to have any 3585  
27 Amendment on here that is controversial. We have ran this 3586  
28 issue of tabling the Amendment by the Democratic leadership on 3587  
29 our side through myself and Representative Schneider. I 3588  
30 understand that on the Republican side, through the leadership 3589  
31 and through the Minority Spokesman of the Education Committee, 3590  
32 at this time I would renew my motion to table Amendment #3." 3591

33 Speaker Bradley: "Discussion. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten." 3592

34 Totten: "Well, how was the Amendment adopted? By a Roll Call?" 3595

35 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Stuffle." 3597

36 Stuffle: "I don't recall if it was a Roll Call or a voice both, 3598



1 Representative." 3599

2 Totten: "Well the Clerk ought to check before we take the Order, and 3600

3 then I would like to know what the Amendment is that you're 3601

4 tabling." 3602

5 Stuffle: "The Amendment...I will answer that part of the question 3603

6 initially, if you want to go ahead and check. The Amendment 3604

7 provided for supplementary claims for districts that had growth 3605

8 from the beginning to the end of the year. The agreement on 3606

9 both sides of the aisle in this Bill, initially was to provide 3607

10 for the elimination of the double O adjustment in the 3608

11 calculation of the School Aid Formula and this Amendment, to 3608

12 some extent, goes against the grain of that concept. It 3609

13 appears that the Amendments were adopted by a voice vote, the 3610

14 Digest and Synopsis indicate no Roll Call, only the fact that 3611

15 they were adopted on Second Reading." 3612

16 Totten: "I have no further questions." 3614

17 Speaker Bradley: "Schneider." 3616

18 Schneider: "I was just going to confirm, Mr. Speaker, Representative 3617

19 Stuffle's point that we have been dealing with this entity or 3618

20 adjustment. The reason the Amendment should go off, in my 3619

21 judgment, is that we will be restoring in part, so I think it's 3620

22 a good idea to table Amendment #3." 3621

23 Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to table 3622

24 Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1172. All in favor of the 3623

25 Gentleman's motion, signify by saying 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 3624

26 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is tabled. Mr. Stuffle." 3626

27 Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave that that Bill 1172 3627

28 remain upon the Order of Short Debate and be moved to Third 3628

29 Reading." 3629

30 Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no 3630

31 objection, we'll leave it on Short Debate. On Page 2, Senate 3631

32 Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 80. We'll now move 3632

33 that 1172 back to Third Reading...Short Debate. Senate Bill 3633

34 80, a third time." 3634

35 Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 80. A Bill for an Act to amend sections 3635

36 of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill." 3637

1 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stanley." 3639

2 Stanley: "...you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This 3640

3 is a Bill that has been debated and discussed for the last 3641

4 three years. It's a Bill that increases the voting hours in 3642

5 Illinois from six to seven o'clock. It does one additional 3643

6 thing. It has an authorization to increase the judges' pay \$10 3644

7 and judges' pay, registrars and canvassers. Let me point out a

8 few basic facts throughout the Country about voting hours. In 3645

9 some thirty-nine other States, we have longer voting hours. 3647

10 Our neighbors in Iowa vote from seven in the morning until nine

11 at night. In Minnesota, they vote from seven in the morning 3648

12 until eight in the evening. Since 1957, when the voting hours 3649

13 were last changed, that's twenty-two years ago, we haven't had 3650

14 a change in voting hours in Illinois. Prior to 1957, the 3651

15 voting hours were from six in the morning until five at night.

16 Now, it's six to six. Here we are twenty-two years later, with 3652

17 substantial changes having taken place in the labor force with 3653

18 the working men and women of Illinois. 1957, there were 3654

19 approximately 4,200,000 working men and women in Illinois. 3655

20 Today, there is in excess of 5,000,000. This is a Bill...who's

21 time has come, and I would request a favorable Roll Call." 3657

22 Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Currie." 3659

23 Currie: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I 3660

24 rise to support this Bill. It is, as Representative Stanley 3661

25 said, one we've talked about any number of times on this House 3662

26 floor. It is a Bill that our voters are asking for. No one is 3663

27 quite sure whether increasing the hours of voting will increase 3664

28 the turnout of the Republican voters or the Democratic voters. 3665

29 My view is that it will increase turnout among all voters. 3666

30 Among Republicans and Democrats alike. It's a Bill, the people

31 in my district, a Democratic district, a heavily Democratic 3668

32 district, have been asking for. I urge us to cross partisan 3669

33 lines on this issue and keep the polling places open the

34 additional hour to respond to the changing work force habit of 3670

35 the Illinois population." 3671

36 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell." 3673

1 Yourell: "Will the Gentleman yield?" 3675

2 Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will." 3677

3 Yourell: "What are the estimated costs of this in the County Cook?" 3678

4 Stanley: "Estimated cost for the total State of Illinois is 3680

5 \$961,000." 3681

6 Yourell: "A Million Dollars. Now, who is going to pay for this?" 3683

7 Stanley: "The State of Illinois." 3685

8 Yourell: "The State of Illinois is going to pay for this?" 3687

9 Stanley: "That's correct." 3689

10 Yourell: "Thank you very much." 3691

11 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Stanley, to close." 3693

12 Stanley: "... very much, once again, it's twenty-two years later, and 3694

13 there's close to a million more working men and women in 3695

14 Illinois and let's offer them the opportunity today to have an 3696

15 additional hour to vote. Thank you." 3697

16 Speaker Bradley: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor, 3698

17 signify by voting 'aye', oppose by voting 'no'. Have all voted 3699

18 who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 3700

19 Record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz. The Clerk 3701

20 will take the Record. On this Question, there are 105 'ayes', 3702

21 44 'nos', 1 voting 'present'. The Bill having received the 3703

22 Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill

23 154. For what purpose does the Lady from Cook, Ms. Braun, 3704

24 rise?" 3705

25 Braun: "Mr. Speaker. Having voted on the prevailing side, I wish to 3706

26 reconsider the vote by which which House Bill...Senate Bill 80 3707

27 was passed." 3708

28 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stanley, moves that 3709

29 that lies on the table. All in favor of the gentleman's 3710

30 motion, signify by voting 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have 3711

31 it. The gentleman's motion to table prevails. Senate Bill 3712

32 154." 3713

33 Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 154. A Bill for an Act to create 3714

34 Criminal Victims' Escrow Account Act. Third Reading of the 3715

35 Bill." 3716

36 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz." 3718

1 Katz: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Lechowicz and I are Co-Sponsors. Mr. 3719  
2 Lechowicz, I think, wanted to open and I will close." 3721  
3 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, to open." 3722  
4 Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 154 is a work product of...not 3724  
5 only of Judge Art Dunn and Judge Ray 'Sedini' but a Gentleman 3725  
6 by the name of Mr. 'Muzula' of the State's Attorneys office. 3726  
7 It creates a criminal compensation victims' account in the 3727  
8 State Treasurer's office. What it does, if a person creates a 3728  
9 violent crime and...subsequent...after the crime...after the  
10 Gentleman is convicted of the crime and he writes a book or 3729  
11 portrays a TV series, the proceeds of the money coming from the 3730  
12 sale of the book or the TV series goes into a special account. 3731  
13 And that special account can be used for the following 3732  
14 purposes: It can be used for legal funds for the individual,  
15 whether it be on the process of an appeal...but it's also for 3733  
16 the compensation of the victim of a crime. And I think that's 3734  
17 the most important thing. It creates a special fund of any 3735  
18 proceeds that are...been generated by the crime, the writing of 3736  
19 the crime, for the victims who the crime was perpetrated on. 3737  
20 I'd be more than happy to answer any questions." 3738  
21 Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, Mr. Katz, to close...Mr. 3739  
22 Greiman." 3740  
23 Greiman: "I have a question to ask." 3742  
24 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Lechowicz or Mr. Katz?" 3744  
25 Greiman: "Mr. Lechowicz or...you know, either one. Yeah, 3745  
26 Representative Lechowicz, if a New York publisher makes a 3746  
27 contract with a defendant in Illinois or maybe the defendant 3747  
28 isn't even in Illinois, as a matter of fact, he may be...he may 3748  
29 be held in another state for another crime? And Will be tried 3749  
30 later on in Illinois. Do they commit an Illinois crime if  
31 neither of them ever are in Illinois? Or if they provide for 3750  
32 payment outside of Illinois, would that be a crime in 3751  
33 Illinois?" 3752  
34 Lechowicz: "It deletes...it provides that the Treasurer, pursuant to 3753  
35 a court order, release the funds from the account for the 3754  
36 defendant for the following issues...as far as their legal 3755

1 representation, criminal or civil proceedings. And I believe 3756  
 2 that as far as it being a criminal intent, if the crime was 3757  
 3 committed in this state, there would probably be more  
 4 evidence...Senate Bill 154 would take precedence. If it was 3758  
 5 created in a different state and the publisher was in this 3759  
 6 state, I don't believe it would take...Senate Bill 154 would 3760  
 7 take affect. Senate Bill 154 is the purpose...if a crime is 3761  
 8 committed here and a person writes or has a TV series on that 3762  
 9 crime that was committed here, the proceeds would then go into 3763  
 10 the special account." 3764

11 Greiman: "Well, how about if the contract..." 3766

12 Lechowicz: "The Bill would not take into affect if the crime was 3767  
 13 committed in New York or any other state." 3769

14 Greiman: "Well, I was thinking of...the crime of the publisher in not 3770  
 15 setting up the escrow. And the question I was asking really 3771  
 16 was, when the...when the...when the criminal makes the deal..." 3772

17 Lechowicz: "If Senate Bill 154 passes..." 3775

18 Greiman: "What?" 3777

19 Lechowicz: "If Senate Bill 154 passes, by court order the Treasurer 3778  
 20 creates an escrow account." 3780

21 Greiman: "Well, but the...the publisher has to pay the money. And if 3781  
 22 he doesn't pay the money then he's violated the Act. The 3782  
 23 question is, can a guy who has never been in Illinois, who has 3783  
 24 never done anything in Illinois, be guilty of a crime in this 3784  
 25 state or be guilty liable in Illinois? And that's really the 3785  
 26 question. Can a New York publisher or a California publisher 3786  
 27 or some other place...get liability without ever coming into 3786  
 28 the State of Illinois? Is that possible?" 3788

29 Lechowicz: "I believe it is." 3790

30 Greiman: "I see. So that we...our laws would have extra territorial 3791  
 31 effect then. Well, I don't know that this Bill is any better 3792  
 32 when Lechowicz presents it than when Katz did." 3794

33 Cullerton: "No...Ted will vote 'no'." 3796

34 Greiman: "But, I mean, that's my own feeling...and you know." 3798

35 Lechowicz: "As you wish." 3800

36 Speaker Bradley: "Discussions? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, to 3801

1 close the debate." 38

2 Katz: "This Bill does not guarantee to victims of crime that they can 38  
3 recover money. It does, however, guarantee to them that if the 38  
4 person who committed the crime against them has sought to 38  
5 exploit that by entering a contract in which the individual 38  
6 tells about the crime, that if the victim does file a civil law 38  
7 suit and recover a judgment against that person that there will 38  
8 be money there for the victim of the crime to satisfy the 38  
9 judgment. That is a reasonable protection for the victims of 38  
10 crime. It does not in any way take away the rights either of 38  
11 the publisher or of the criminal. It is only when the courts 38  
12 of this state, in a civil suit, have entered a civil judgment 38  
13 against that criminal that the money, in fact, would be taken. 38  
14 Otherwise, the money would be turned by the Treasurer, back to 38  
15 the criminal if there is no judgment recovered. This is a 38  
16 useful step toward protecting the rights of victims of crime. 38  
17 And we would urge the passage of Senate Bill 154." 38

18 Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in 38  
19 favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have 38  
20 all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted 38  
21 who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 38  
22 there are 136 'ayes', 16 'nos'. This Bill having received the 38  
23 Constitutional Convention...Constitutional Majority is hereby 38  
24 declared passed. ...Bills on Second Reading...Page 2, Third 38  
25 Reading, appears House Bill 1400." 38

26 Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1400. A Bill for an Act to create the 38  
27 Department of Commerce. Third Reading of the Bill." 38

28 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Hallock." 38

29 Hallock: "Thank Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 38  
30 House Bill 1400, as you all know, is the Bill that which would 38  
31 established on the state level, a Department of Commerce. What 38  
32 it does specifically, is merge BED and part of DLGA. I must 38  
33 say to you today, that this Bill is a compromise proposal one 38  
34 which has been worked out between the Unions, the Chamber of 38  
35 Commerce, the Governor's Office, and of course members of the 38  
36 aisle on both sides. The Bill briefly comes in a context

1 wherein the Illinois business climate is one which has been 3839  
 2 suffering over the years. As a matter of fact, the Illinois  
 3 Business Review, a publication at the U of I, has pointed out 3840  
 4 recently, the Illinois employment growth has laxed behind that 3841  
 5 of the Nation. House Bill 1400, I believe, will address many 3842  
 6 of the problems that employers as well as employees are faced 3843  
 7 with today. The way it differs from the Executive Order is  
 8 basically this one way. House Bill 1400 does not include 3844  
 9 within its provisions, the Governor's Office of Manpower and 3845  
 10 Human Development. That, I say to you, is the main difference 3846  
 11 between the Governor's Order and House Bill 1400. I would ask 3847  
 12 for your favorable support and remind you again that this is a 3848  
 13 compromise proposal which has been worked out long and hard  
 14 over the last few months and I would ask for your support." 3850

15 Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall 3851  
 16 this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', 'oppose 3852  
 17 by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who 3853  
 18 wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there 3854  
 19 are 143 'ayes', 3 'nays'. This Bill having received the 3855  
 20 Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill, 3856  
 21 Second Reading, Page 4, appears Senate Bill 101. Mr. Deuster.  
 22 Second Reading of Senate Bill 101." 3858

23 O'Brien: "Senate Bill 101. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of 3859  
 24 the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was 3860  
 25 adopted in Committee." 3861

26 Speaker Bradley: "Any motion relative to Amendment #1?" 3863

27 Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed." 3865

28 Speaker Bradley: "Further Amendments." 3867

29 Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Schneider. Amends Senate Bill 101 as 3868  
 30 amended by deleting the first sentence of the second paragraph 3869  
 31 and soforth." 3870

32 Speaker Bradley: "Is Mr. Schneider in the chamber? The Sponsor of 3871  
 33 the Amendment is not here. Do you want to proceed or what's 3872  
 34 your. Turn Mr. Deuster on." 3873

35 Deuster: "Well, I would prefer to proceed. It's a very important 3874  
 36 Bill and I have been waiting for it to be called and I assume 3875

1 the Sponsor of the Amendment is probably waiting. I don't want 3876  
 2 to be disrespectful of anybody's right, but I would prefer that 3877  
 3 the Bill proceed." 3878

4 Speaker Bradley: "Okay, alright, we'll proceed then. Is that an 3879  
 5 agreed Amendment or anything? Do you want to move..." 3881

6 Deuster: "No, it's an Amendment that would gut the Bill and I have 3882  
 7 opposed the Amendment and, if necessary, I would move to table 3883  
 8 the Amendment, if that were a parliamentary procedure." 3885

9 Speaker Bradley: "Further Amendments." 3887

10 Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3. Hoffman. Amends Senate Bill 3888  
 11 101, as amended, by inserting after the last sentence of the 3889  
 12 second paragraph..." 3890

13 Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute. Mr. Kane, for what purpose do you 3891  
 14 rise, Sir?" 3892

15 Kane: "Yes, with leave of the House, I would handle Amendment #2 for 3893  
 16 Representative Schneider." 3895

17 Speaker Bradley: "We hear objections to it, so Amendment #3. Whose 3896  
 18 Amendment was that? Is Mr. Hoffman on the floor? Mr. Deuster, 3897  
 19 what's your preference?" 3898

20 Deuster: "Well, my preference is to move forward. Hoffman..." 3900

21 Speaker Bradley: "Further Amendments." 3902

22 Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4. Anderson. Amends Senate Bill 3903  
 23 101, as amended, in the first paragraph of Section 29-3 and so 3904  
 24 forth." 3905

25 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson." 3907

26 Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Under Senate Bill 101, as amended, 29-3 3908  
 27 takes out any of which district has a population of less than 3909  
 28 500,000. Though Chicago is not, currently is not mandated to 3910  
 29 provide transportation under Section 29-3, however, if they 3911  
 30 choose a transport, they can apply for reimbursement under 3912  
 31 Section 29-5. Now, Chicago does receive some reimbursement  
 32 under 29-5 and if this Amendment is not adopted, Chicago could 3913  
 33 not receive reimbursement and would be forced to absorb the 3914  
 34 cost. In addition, it would partic...it would prohibit their 3915  
 35 participation in new provisions of Senate Bill 101. Senate 3916  
 36 Bill 101, as amended, is good legislation. Chicago should have 3917



1 the opportunity to provide services and subsequently, apply for 3918  
 2 reimbursement. Now, for too long, and for too many Bills this 3919  
 3 time, I have seen where we are dividing the State further and 3920  
 4 further and we're one State, we have problems, we should deal 3921  
 5 with our problems as a State, not as separate entities and I  
 6 move the adoption of this Amendment." 3923

7 Speaker Bradley: "Discussion. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. 3924  
 8 Kane." 3925

9 Kane: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?" 3927

10 Speaker Bradley: "The Sponsor of the Amendment?" 3929

11 Kane: "Yes." 3931

12 Speaker Bradley: "Indicates he yields." 3933

13 Kane: "I am not sure of what you are saying. Does this Amendment 3934  
 14 bring Chicago in or take Chicago out? And, if this Amendment 3935  
 15 is adopted, what would be the result?" 3937

16 Anderson: "Well, Chicago, as you know, is a charter district. They 3938  
 17 are really not covered by 29-3 where they are trying to take 3939  
 18 them out. They are trying to take them out of something that 3940  
 19 they are really not in, but..." 3941

20 Kane: "Now, with this Amendment, will Chicago have to provide the 3942  
 21 same transportation as other school districts, or not?" 3944

22 Anderson: "No. It would be permissive. They could do it if they 3945  
 23 wish." 3946

24 Kane: "And the rest of the school districts would have to?" 3948

25 Anderson: "If they are doing it now. Chicago gets their 3949  
 26 transportation from another Section, ah..." 3951

27 Kane: "Doesn't this Bill have to do with transporting private 3952  
 28 schools..students to any private school within 10 miles of a 3953  
 29 school district's boundaries?" 3954

30 Anderson: "Any school, not necessarily private schools, but the 3955  
 31 spending district must be providing transportation and also the 3956  
 32 receiving districts must be providing it. Both districts." 3958

33 Kane: "So, does this mean that Chicago would have to provide the 3959  
 34 transportation, or not?" 3961

35 Anderson: "No, it would be permissive. They are not doing it now, 3962  
 36 except for Special Ed." 3964

- 1 Kane: "So, it would be mandatory downstate and permissive in Chicago?" 3965  
2 Chicago?" 3966
- 3 Anderson: "If downstate, they are providing it now. That is 3967  
4 correct." 3968
- 5 Kane: "But, if 101 passes, then it would be mandatory, right?" 3970
- 6 Anderson: "It would be mandatory for downstate in those districts 3971  
7 that are now providing it. That is exactly right." 3973
- 8 Kane: "And for the districts that are not." 3975
- 9 Anderson: "No." 3977
- 10 Kane: "So it would be a new mandate." 3979
- 11 Anderson: "It would be a mandate, but if the downstate district is 3980  
12 not now providing transportation, they would not have to do it 3981  
13 under this Bill." 3982
- 14 Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would 3983  
15 oppose this Amendment. I think that if we are going to go to 3984  
16 the position of transporting private school students to any 3985  
17 school within 10 miles of our school districts' boundaries 3986  
18 that's outside of that district, that it should be provided  
19 state-wide and not simply imposed on those school districts 3987  
20 that are downstate, and I would oppose this Amendment." 3989
- 21 Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. 3990  
22 White." 3991
- 23 White: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If 3992  
24 Amendment 4 were to pass, I have Amendment #6 and #6 takes 3993  
25 Chicago out of the Bill and the Sponsor of this Amendment seeks 3994  
26 to put it in. I am opposed to Amendment #4." 3995
- 27 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh." 3997
- 28 Walsh: "Will the Gentleman yield, Sponsor." 3999
- 29 Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he." 4001
- 30 Walsh: "I'm a little bit confused as to what Amendment #4 does. It 4002  
31 seems, I thought that it a provided that Chicago would be 4003  
32 mandated to transport private school students. Is that 4004  
33 correct?" 4005
- 34 Anderson: "No, they are not mandated to do it now." 4007
- 35 Walsh: "I know they aren't now. I thought that that was what your 4008  
Amendment did." 4009

1 Anderson: "What this would do, it would allow them to continue to 4010  
2 receive the reimbursement they are getting under 29-5. They 4011  
3 are getting some reimbursement from this particular Section of 4012  
4 the a..." 4013

5 Walsh: "But, that reimbursement is reimbursement to the Chicago 4014  
6 Transit Authority, isn't it? Or is that special education?" 4016

7 Anderson: "No, it's regular education." 4018

8 Walsh: "Special education?" 4020

9 Anderson: "Regular education." 4022

10 Walsh: "Oh, so what the Amendment provides then is that a..that 4023  
11 those...Chicago would have to transport students, as the Bill 4024  
12 provides." 4025

13 Anderson: "If they choose to do it. It makes it permissive. If we 4026  
14 take them out the way the Bill says, they cannot do it. And 4027  
15 cannot receive reimbursement. If we take the language out..." 4028

16 Walsh: "Then with your Amendment, they may do it. Without your 4030  
17 Amendment, they may not do it." 4032

18 Anderson: "That's exactly right." 4034

19 Walsh: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in behalf of the 4035  
20 Amendment. Although it doesn't do what I would hope that it 4036  
21 would do, and that is mandate, as would be mandated throughout 4037  
22 the rest of the State. That private school students be 4038  
23 transported up to 10 miles beyond the limits of the school 4039  
24 district, because I, as others, have indicated, see no reason 4040  
25 why there should be a distinction between Chicago and the rest 4041  
26 of the State. There are many good private high schools in the 4042  
27 suburban area that a, would very much like to have students 4043  
28 transported from Chicago to those schools. I can think of one. 4044  
29 St. Josephs in Westchester, where Isaiah Thomas, the greatest 4045  
30 basketball player in this State, came by whatever means, from 4046  
31 Chicago to Westchester to attend school there. It would have 4047  
32 been great if he had a bus ride for those four years. Let me 4048  
33 suggest to you that there is absolutely no reason on earth why 4049  
34 Chicago should not be included, especially since the private 4048  
35 schools in Chicago seem to be closing down at rather an  
36 alarming rate. It seems to me that those people that want to 4049

1 avail themselves in Chicago, a private education ought to, if 4050  
 2 it is done in other parts of the State, have an opportunity to 4051  
 3 have their kids transported. So, I urge the adoption of this 4052  
 4 Amendment." 4053

5 Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion. Mr. Anderson, do you wish to 4054  
 6 close on your Amendment?" 4056

7 Anderson: "Well, I would just appreciate your 'aye' vote. It's a, 4057  
 8 without this Amendment, Chicago could not participate. With 4058  
 9 it, they have the option." 4059

10 Speaker Bradley: "The question is an adoption of this Amendment. All 4060  
 11 in favor will signify by voting 'aye', oppose by voting 'no'. 4061  
 12 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all 4062  
 13 voted who wish? The...Mr. Deuster to explain his vote." 4064

14 Deuster: "Well, yes, in explaining my 'no' vote, even though 4065  
 15 Representative Anderson and I generally agree philosophically 4066  
 16 that there should be one system for the entire State. In this 4067  
 17 case, Chicago is different. They would not be involved in the 4068  
 18 provisions of the Act. They do have public transportation in 4069  
 19 the City of Chicago, which is adequate and it is my 4070  
 20 understanding that Chicago is not interested in being in this. 4071  
 21 Also, the adoption of this Amendment would increase or open the 4072  
 22 potential for expense, further expense or costs under the Bill, 4073  
 23 which I don't think we need to do at this time, so I would urge 4074  
 24 for a 'no' vote. Thank you." 4075

25 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Leinenweber, did you want 4076  
 26 to explain your vote sir? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk 4077  
 27 will take the record. On this question, there are 63 'ayes' 4078  
 28 and 81 'nos' and the motion failed. Further Amendments." 4080

29 Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5. McClain. Amends Senate Bill 101, as 4081  
 30 amended, in Section 29-3 and so forth." 4083

31 Speaker Bradley: "McClain. Is Mr. McClain on the floor? Further 4084  
 32 Amendments." 4085

33 Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6. White. Amends Senate Bill 101, as 4086  
 34 amended, by deleting the second sentence of Section 29-1 and so 4087  
 35 forth." 4088

36 Speaker Bradley: " The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. White." 4090

1 White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ah, Senate 4091  
 2 Bill, Senate Bill 101, Amendment #6, takes the City of Chicago 4092  
 3 out of the business of transporting students a mile and a half 4093  
 4 from their school, for parochial school students, and all this 4094  
 5 does is take Chicago out of the Bill." 4095

6 Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion. Question on the Gentleman's 4096  
 7 motion. All in favor...Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane." 4098

8 Kane: "Would the Sponsor of the Amendment explain that once more?" 4100

9 White: "What happened is this is an agreed Amendment between 4101  
 10 Representative Deuster and I and all the Bill does is it 4102  
 11 clarifies the fact that Chicago, ah, which is not included in 4103  
 12 the Bill, but, we want to make sure that someone could not come 4104  
 13 back later on and include Chicago into the Bill. So, we are 4105  
 14 talking about a school district of 500,000 or more." 4106

15 Kane: "So, with this Amendment, what you're doing, is forcing 4107  
 16 downstate school districts to provide this kind of 4108  
 17 transportation to any private school within 10 miles of the 4109  
 18 school district's boundaries, but excluding the City of Chicago 4110  
 19 and the Chicago School District." 4111

20 White: "Well, I don't know if that what your interpretation is. All 4112  
 21 I seek to do is remove Chicago from the Bill. We're not in it 4113  
 22 at present, but I wanted to make...with this Amendment, it 4114  
 23 makes sure that someone could not come back and say House 4115  
 24 Bill...Senate Bill 101 provides transportation for parochial 4116  
 25 school students a mile and a half from their schools and 4117  
 26 Chicago has the responsibility of picking up the tab." 4118

27 Kane: "If you would expand your Amendment to include all the rest of 4119  
 28 the school districts in the State, I could support it." 4121

29 White: "Well, Chicago is not in the program anyway. All I am doing 4122  
 30 is making sure that no one can come back and include it in." 4124

31 Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think 4125  
 32 that we have enough differences among the areas of this State 4126  
 33 as it is and I would oppose this Amendment and ask the Members 4127  
 34 of the House to oppose it also." 4128

35 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson." 4130

36 Anderson: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?" 4132

1 Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will." 4134

2 Anderson: "You do realize, Representative White, that Chicago does 4135  
3 receive some reimbursement under Section 29-5 and if this 4136  
4 Amendment goes on, they will have to absorb this, they will 4137  
5 lose it. You realize that?" 4138

6 White: "I don't know if you have been looking at the Bill. I don't 4139  
7 have it in front of me, but I read it earlier, and Chicago is 4140  
8 not included in there anyway, if you took a good look at the 4141  
9 Bill. They are not mandated, but they do apply and they 4142  
10 participate and get funds under 29-5." 4143

11 Anderson: "This is Section 29-3?" 4145

12 White: "Exactly. The two tie together." 4147

13 Speaker Bradley: "Any discussion. Hearing none. The question is on 4148  
14 the Gentleman's motion. White, do you care to close?" 4150

15 White: "Well, I think I made my case. I would like to adopt 4151  
16 Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 101." 4153

17 Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Gentleman's 4154  
18 Amendment #6. Question on the Gentleman's motion, all in 4155  
19 favor, signify by voting 'aye', oppose by voting 'no'. Have 4156  
20 all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted 4157  
21 who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 4158  
22 there are 75 'ayes' and 65 'nos'. The Gentleman's motion 4159  
23 prevails and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments." 4160

24 Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments. A request to fiscal note to 4161  
25 Senate Bill 101, as amended, by Representative Schneider." 4163

26 Speaker Bradley: "Is Schneider here to move that motion? Kane, are 4164  
27 you going to say that he doesn't have to be here?" 4166

28 Kane: "I would raise that point of order." 4168

29 Speaker Bradley: "Let's just check the Rules. 32F, Rule 32F. It 4169  
30 indicates any Floor Amendment to such a Bill which would 4170  
31 substantially affect a fiscal or judicial note previously 4171  
32 filed, shall be deferred until the Sponsor of the Amendment 4172  
33 presents a revised note upon a motion of any member. And, the 4173  
34 member is not here. Mr. Kane, from Sangamon." 4174

35 Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I think that I have already signed that motion 4175  
36 and filed it and I would make that motion." 4177

1 Speaker Bradley: "Okay, so you made...Mr. Kane now moves that the 4178  
2 Bill be held on Second Reading until the fiscal note is 4179  
3 provided." 4180  
4 Kane: "Thank you." 4182  
5 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, on the 4183  
6 Gentleman's motion." 4184  
7 Deuster: "Yes, on the Gentleman's motion, a fiscal note that was 4185  
8 filed on this Bill, as it was amended with Amendment #1, none 4186  
9 of the...no Amendments were adopted to this Bill, except one 4187  
10 which excludes Chicago and really clarifies what was in the 4188  
11 Bill to begin with. That Amendment has no fiscal impact 4189  
12 whatsoever, and I believe that motion is out of order and would  
13 ask that the Bill move to Third Reading. The fiscal note has 4190  
14 been filed. I would simply file it again, if that, you know, 4191  
15 procedure were necessary. But, I don't think it is. Under the 4192  
16 Fiscal Note Act, no Amendment was adopted affecting the Bill 4193  
17 fiscally." 4194  
18 Speaker Bradley: "Kane." 4196  
19 Kane: "Mr. Speaker, could I inquire as to who prepared that fiscal 4197  
20 note?" 4198  
21 Speaker Bradley: "For the first one? For the first Amendment?" 4200  
22 Kane: "For the first one and whether or not..." 4202  
23 Speaker Bradley: "Robert Leinenweber, Assistant Superintendent 4203  
24 Leininger, Assistant Superintendent, Illinois Office of 4204  
25 Education." 4205  
26 Kane: "Thank you." 4207  
27 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk." 4209  
28 Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we did accept Amendment #6 and in the 4210  
29 debate, it appears that it did have a fiscal impact upon the 4211  
30 legislation. I think that there was some real question among 4212  
31 those who were involved in the debate, whether it did or did 4213  
32 not, and what line items you were talking about. I do believe 4214  
33 the fiscal note is in order." 4215  
34 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson." 4217  
35 Anderson: "Mr. Speaker, not only for that reason. I wonder if the 4218  
36 Clerk could read the fiscal note attached to the Membership." 4219

1 Clerk O'Brien: "Fiscal Note Senate Bill 101, as amended. Senate Bill 4221  
2 101 is amended by House Amendment #1, provides for 4222  
3 transportation for resident students in schools located within 4223  
4 10 miles from the district boundaries. As amended, this Bill 4224  
5 is now similar to Senate Bill 1310. For fiscal year 1980, this 4225  
6 Bill will have have no affect on state funds for pupil 4226  
7 transportation. Payments during fiscal year 1980 for 4227  
8 transportation will be based upon claims filed for the 1978-79  
9 school year. The Illinois Office of Education is unable to 4228  
10 project the fiscal year 1981 impact of this Bill, as amended. 4229  
11 The fiscal impact will depend upon the number of students 4230  
12 actually transported under the provisions of this Bill during 4231  
13 the 1979-80 school year, which begins in September, 1979. 4232  
14 Robert Leininger, Assistant Superintendent, Illinois Office of  
15 Education." 4233

16 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Anderson." 4235

17 Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have another fiscal note that has been 4236  
18 drawn up by BOB and they claim the cost, depending on the 4237  
19 number that participate, between 7 1/2 million and 78.2 4238  
20 million. Now, this note was addressed to Representative 4239  
21 Deuster and I wonder, if by House Rules, he has to file it, or 4240  
22 he can file what he wants, or what?" 4241

23 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh." 4243

24 Walsh: "Well, now, while you're mulling that over, I would just agree 4244  
25 with the point that Representative Polk made that by the 4245  
26 adoption of Amendment #, I believe it was 5 or was it 6, 4246  
27 Representative White's Amendment, there has to be some fiscal 4247  
28 impact, or else it would have been pointless for us to adopt 4248  
29 that Amendment. Now, if it's unclear or was unclear before the  
30 adoption of this Amendment as to whether Chicago was to 4249  
31 participate, it is now perfectly clear, and I think we should 4250  
32 have a fiscal note on the impact of that Amendment." 4252

33 Speaker Bradley: "The question on the Gentleman's...Mr. Kane's 4253  
34 motion, and we are going to take a vote on this motion whether 4254  
35 we hold the Bill on...it...it's on..it's in...it's in the 4255  
36 Rules, 32F, it says upon the motion of any member, adopted by a 4257



1 majority of the House. It takes a majority of the House, to 4258  
 2 hold the Bill on Second Reading for this type of a situation,  
 3 but that's probably not what...you're probably right there. It 4259  
 4 probably wasn't the intent, but that's the way the Rule was 4260  
 5 written and we have to abide, so the question on the adoption 4261  
 6 of Mr. Kane's motion to hold the Bill on Second Reading, until 4262  
 7 the fiscal note...revised fiscal note is supplied to the 4263  
 8 Bill...and on that question, those in favor of the Gentleman's  
 9 motion will vote 'aye' and oppose will vote 'no' and the 4264  
 10 Gentleman Sangamon, Mr. Kane, to explain his vote." 4266

11 Kane: "Could, could I, just a parliamentary inquiry. How many votes 4267  
 12 does it require?" 4268

13 Speaker Bradley: "Simple majority." 4270

14 Kane: "Thank you." 4272

15 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 4273

16 The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, to explain his vote." 4274

17 Hoffman: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of 4276  
 18 the House. This Bill and the course of this Bill is 4277  
 19 significant enough that we should have agreement and we should 4278  
 20 know what kind of money we are talking about. At least, get 4279  
 21 agreement of the parties involved, in terms of what the cost of 4280  
 22 this is going to be. Without that, we're going to be voting,  
 23 ah...we're going to be voting very blindly on this and for this 4281  
 24 reason, I believe this motion should be supported." 4283

25 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 4284

26 The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 59 4285

27 'ayes' and 64 'nos' and the Gentleman's motion fails and we'll 4286

28 move the Bill to Third Reading. Senate Bill 157. Is Bonds in 4287

29 the chambers? Senate Bill 587. Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. 4288

30 Bower." 4289

31 Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 587. A Bill for an Act making 4290

32 appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the 4291

33 Governor's Office of Manpower and Human Development. Second 4292

34 Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, were 4293

35 adopted in Committee." 4294

36 Speaker Bradley: "Any motion relative to those Amendments?" 4296

1 Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #7, by Representative 4297  
2 Conti, no, I'm sorry, Catania and Stanley." 4299

3 Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from McHenry, 4300  
4 Mr. Skinner rise?" 4301

5 Skinner: "A port of....A point of parliamentary inquiry. I wonder 4302  
6 why we just skipped five or six Bills that seemed to be on the 4303  
7 same order of business?" 4304

8 Speaker Bradley: "They are doing some work on them evidently." 4306

9 Skinner: "Who is doing some work? The Sponsors' want the Bills, I am 4307  
10 told." 4308

11 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewing." 4310

12 Skinner: "Are you doing work on them? Is Representative Madigan 4311  
13 doing work on it?" 4312

14 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Ewing." 4314

15 Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, ah, I rise on the same point. I realize 4315  
16 that I have been told that there is a hold on the Department of 4316  
17 Revenue's appropriation Bill. Now, if somebody is doing some 4317  
18 work on that Bill, I would think that they might be wanting to 4318  
19 contact the Sponsor, or some of the members of that department, 4319  
20 and I think that before this House takes one step further, we 4320  
21 should have an answer as to when these Bills are going to be  
22 called. They have been passed over now for almost a week. 4321  
23 When are they going to take H-O-L-D off of it?" 4323

24 Speaker Bradley: "They will be called this week. We have to go to 4324  
25 Mr. Bower's Bill. It has been called. It's an appropriation 4325  
26 Bill. 587. We are trying to get that moved. What was the 4326  
27 ah...Susan Catania on the Amendment #7, you have a motion to 4327  
28 table...Representative Catania." 4328

29 Catania: "Speaker, this really doesn't feel like a nice tranquil time 4329  
30 to call it." 4330

31 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Collins, will let you move your motion, I'm 4331  
32 sure. These are appropriations and we're calling them on 4332  
33 Second Reading and that's what everybody requested. Mrs. 4333  
34 Catania you're recognized. Mrs. Catania is recognized to 4334  
35 table...on her motion to table. Mr. Collins, for what purpose 4335  
36 do you rise?" 4336

1 Collins: "Now, Mr. Speaker, you yourself just stated that you have to 4337  
2 go to Mr. Bower's Bill. I don't know why you have to go...." 4338  
3 Speaker Bradley: "No, I said, I already, already called his Bill." 4341  
4 Collins: "Your on...Mr. Speaker, you are violating the Rules. You 4342  
5 are not following in order down the calendar. There are Bills 4343  
6 ahead of that, that are not only also appropriation Bills, but 4344  
7 also bear an earlier date on the priority list. You have no 4345  
8 right to skip over those Bills and call this Bill. You are 4346  
9 totally outside, well, the scope of our House Rules and there 4347  
10 is no way that you can justify this action. Now, Mr. Speaker, 4348  
11 fair is fair. Let's get back to the Bills that you should have 4348  
12 called. This Bill is only a couple away and we'll get to Mr. 4349  
13 Bower's Bill too and I am sure that will make him happy also." 4350  
14 Speaker Bradley: "Senate Bill 587. We're going to call the Bills. 4352  
15 Senate Bill 587. Mrs. Catania, do you wish to move with 4353  
16 the...your motion to table Amendment #7?" 4355  
17 Catania: "Mr. Speaker, if the Sponsor is keeping it in the record, 4356  
18 then I would certainly want to go with the motion to table. 4357  
19 Yes. Are you keeping it in the record, Representative Bowers?" 4358  
20 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Bowers." 4361  
21 Bowers: "Mr. Speaker, if you are not going to yield to Representative 4362  
22 Ewing, I want to proceed with my Bill." 4364  
23 Speaker Bradley: "What?" 4366  
24 Bowers: "I say, if you are not going to proceed with Mr. Ewing's 4367  
25 Bill, I want to proceed with mine." 4369  
26 Speaker Bradley: "You want to proceed with your's." 4371  
27 Bowers: "Yes." 4373  
28 Speaker Bradley: "Well, that's...the place where we are. The 4374  
29 Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan." 4376  
30 Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, would you mind explaining to the members how it 4377  
31 is that you can sit there and totally violate the Rules of the 4378  
32 House, without leave, without any authority to do it. How you 4379  
33 can be the king and judge of who can pick what Bills as you go 4380  
34 down this calendar. Would you mind explaining that to me and 4381  
35 the other members of this House. What gives you the authority 4382  
36 to do that, Mr. Speaker. I mean...I don't know, just because

1 somebody's written Madigan or somebody has written Hold on your 4383  
 2 calendar doesn't give you the authority to jump over a member's 4384  
 3 Bill. Now, either follow the Rules or get out of the Chair. 4385  
 4 And I wish you would give us an explanation for what authority 4386  
 5 you've got to violate the Rules. Now, how can you do that. 4387  
 6 Will you explain that to us? Get the Parliamentarian and give 4388  
 7 us an explanation for that." 4389

8 Speaker Bradley: "Appropriation Bills are exempt. We don't have to 4390  
 9 push those along. Senate Bill 587. Mr. Bowers wants to go 4391  
 10 with that Bill. So, we will proceed with 587 and we'll get 4392  
 11 back to...Gentleman takes it out of the record. Mr. McPike. 4393  
 12 Concurrences. House Bill 14. Mr. Daniels. House Bill 79. 4394  
 13 Terzich and Lechowicz. House Bill 112. Representative 4395  
 14 Deuster." 4395

15 Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On House 4396  
 16 Bill 112, I am asking that we concur with the Senate Amendment. 4397  
 17 House Bill 112 is the Bill amending the Dissolution of Marriage 4398  
 18 Act, which, as it went out of the House, allowed the parties to 4399  
 19 a divorce proceeding to agree to waive the bifurcated trial. 4400  
 20 The Senate amended this Bill to allow the court, in addition to 4401  
 21 the parties, to have a discretion to waive that trial. Ah, 4402  
 22 this Amendment that was added in the Senate, was one that, as 4403  
 23 many of you know, was suggested by Judge Charles Fleck who is 4404  
 24 head of the Divorce Division of the Cook County Circuit Court. 4404  
 25 There is a tremendous backlog there and many parties to divorce 4405  
 26 proceedings contribute to that backlog by delaying and the 4406  
 27 bifurcated trial is a real difficult thing to do. I think this 4407  
 28 Amendment would give the judge the discretion, in those cases, 4408  
 29 where parties were delaying just to try to get a better 4409  
 30 settlement or something to bring them to trial. On the other 4410  
 31 hand, the legitimate continuances for a good cause would be 4411  
 32 allowed. I would be happy to answer any questions. I think 4412  
 33 the...in my own opinion, the Senate Amendment was a good one 4413  
 34 and that it does give the judges, as well as the two parties, 4414  
 35 the discretion to settle a divorce proceeding on one day, 4415  
 36 instead of having to come back to court twice." 4416

1 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer." 4416  
2 Brummer: "Yes, once again, we are here considering the same issues, 4417  
3 for at least the second or possibly the third time. The 4418  
4 Sponsor had this Bill originally in the Judiciary Committee. 4419  
5 The Judiciary Committee would not vote the Bill out, until it 4420  
6 was amended in the shape that it was when it went out of the 4421  
7 House. Then, when it was on the House floor, or, unless it was 4422  
8 in relationship to some other Bill, the Sponsor once again  
9 tried this Amendment. The House defeated that Amendment and 4423  
10 now...and then passed, then passed the Bill out. It goes over 4424  
11 to the Senate and now the Sponsor is back moving to concur with 4425  
12 regard to an Amendment that the Senate put on that was defeated 4426  
13 in the House Judiciary Committee and was defeated here on the 4427  
14 House floor. To the merits, er.. the lack of merits of the..of  
15 the Senate Amendment, as you know, in the re-organization and 4428  
16 the codification of the Marital Dissolution Act of two years 4429  
17 ago, it provided bifurcated hearings when there was a contested 4430  
18 matter. The Bill, as it left the house, provided that that 4431  
19 separation of the issues on the merits of the divorce and the 4432  
20 merits of the property settlement or the child support could be  
21 waived by the parties, if they agreed. Now the problem that 4433  
22 arises is that the attorneys will not know, going into a 4434  
23 contested divorce matter, whether or not the Judge is going to 4435  
24 order them to proceed immediately without a bifurcated hearing. 4436  
25 The attorneys are then in a quandary. They do not know whether 4437  
26 to prepare for the second portion of the hearing or not,  
27 because they do not know in advance whether the judge is going 4438  
28 to so order them. That is the worst of both worlds. Either we 4439  
29 ought to abolish the bifurcated hearing process completely, or 4440  
30 we ought to at least allow it to be of the discretion of the 4441  
31 attorneys and the parties on whether or not they waive it. The 4442  
32 attorneys otherwise will not know, going into a contested 4443  
33 matter, of whether or not the judge, after hearing the divorce 4444  
34 on this marriage, is going to order them to immediately proceed  
35 with regard to the issues of property settlement, with regard 4445  
36 to the issue of support, child support, and they will not be 4446

1 able to adequately prepare for that. This was defeated...this 4447  
 2 concept was defeated in the Judiciary Committee, it was 4448  
 3 defeated on the House floor, when it was offered as an 4449  
 4 Amendment and we ought to non-concur and vote 'no' here with  
 5 regard to this motion." 4450

6 Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion. Mr. Deuster, do you want to 4451  
 7 close. Deuster." 4452

8 Deuster: "Yes, I would like to close. I think that this is a very 4453  
 9 important Amendment, as Representative Erummer knows, when this 4454  
 10 Bill came through the Committee, I said I didn't care one way 4455  
 11 or the other, although I did offer the Amendment in committee. 4456  
 12 It was not adopted in committee, but Representative Erummer was 4457  
 13 mistaken. There was no effort on my part to offer it on the 4458  
 14 floor. This is a very important Amendment giving judges all 4459  
 15 around the state discretion ah...they have had a...really we  
 16 always had divorce proceedings handled on one day. I think if 4460  
 17 any lawyer has good reason to ask for the bifurcated trial, I 4461  
 18 don't know any judges that would not allow that, but this does 4462  
 19 avoid footdragging. It is important to help avoid the 4463  
 20 congestion in the Cook County Circuit Courts. I think it's a  
 21 good Amendment. The Senate action, it's a Senate action, I 4464  
 22 concur with it and I ask for your favorable 'yes' vote on this 4465  
 23 concurrence. Thank you." 4466

24 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in 4467  
 25 Amendment #1 to House Bill 112. All in favor of the 4468  
 26 Gentleman's motion, signify by voting 'aye', those oppose by 4469  
 27 voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who 4470  
 28 wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the  
 29 record. On this, there are 50 'ayes', 74 'nos' and the 4471  
 30 Gentleman's motion fails and the House does not concur with 4473  
 31 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 112. We have a substitute 4474  
 32 motion? A move for non-concur?" 4475

33 Deuster: "Since the vote seems to be quite strong there, a clear 4476  
 34 message of the sentiment of the House. I move to non-concur." 4477

35 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman moves the House non-concurs in Senate 4479  
 36 Amendment #1 to House Bill 112. All in favor, signify by 4480

1 saying 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House 4481  
2 non-concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 112. House 4482  
3 142. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis." 4483  
4 Bradley: "On the concurrence motions, sir." 4485  
5 Davis: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I move to concur in 4486  
6 Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 142. This is a House 4487  
7 version of the Row Crop Bill...excuse me.." 4489  
8 Speaker Bradley: "Three and four." 4491  
9 Davis: "Oh, I'm sorry, I wasn't looking at the calendar. I thought 4492  
10 it was 1 and 2. 3 and 4, which essentially puts the same Bill, 4493  
11 er the Bill in the same shape as the Senate Bill we passed out 4494  
12 of here the other day. It's the standing Row Crop Bill and if 4496  
13 you would like an explanation of the Amendments, I will give 4497  
14 them to you, but this House has voted unanimously practically 4498  
15 to pass this Bill and its Amendments out and I would solicit 4498  
16 your 'aye' support for the concurrent motion." 4500  
17 Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Gentleman's 4501  
18 motion. All in favor, signify by voting 'aye', oppose by 4502  
19 voting 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all 4503  
20 voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this 4504  
21 question, there are 156 'ayes' 2 'nos' and the House does 4505  
22 concur in Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 142. House 4506  
23 Bill 160. The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman. House 4506  
24 Bill 160, Senate Amendment #1." 4508  
25 VonBoeckman: "Speaker and Members of the House, I would concur in 4509  
26 Senate Amendment #1." 4510  
27 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate 4511  
28 Amendment #1 to House Bill 160. The Gentleman from Champaign, 4512  
29 Mr. Johnson." 4513  
30 Johnson: "Could we know what Amendment #1 is, so we know what we're 4514  
31 voting on?" 4515  
32 VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #1 just makes a uniform on 4516  
33 the a...on how many inches a handle bar can be on a motorcycle. 4517  
34 Just a technical Amendment. It was put on in the Senate. It 4518  
35 conforms with the federal standards." 4519  
36 Johnson: "Okay, thank you." 4521

1 Speaker Bradley: "Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen." 4523

2 Pullen: "Will the Sponsor yield?" 4525

3 Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will." 4527

4 Pullen: "Since this is final passage, sir, I wonder whether you would 4528  
5 tell us whether the Bill with and without the Senate Amendment, 4529  
6 is still the Bill that weakens the enforcement of the Lights On 4530  
7 Law for motorcycles?" 4531

8 VonBoeckman: "Yes, it's the same Bill. It doesn't change 4532  
9 any...any...anything as far as the Lights On Bill." 4534

10 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur with 4535  
11 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 160. All in favor, signify 4536  
12 by voting 'aye', oppose by voting 'no'. Have all voted who 4537  
13 wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question, there are 4538  
14 13...the Clerk will take the record. On this question, there 4539  
15 are 144 'ayes', 6 'nos' and the House does concur in Senate 4540  
16 Amendment #1 to House Bill 160. House Bill 163. The Gentleman  
17 from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman." 4542

18 VonBoeckman: "Again, Mr. Speaker, what a Senate Amendment does. It 4543  
19 requires all vehicles carrying hazard material, as defined in 4544  
20 the Illinois Hazard Bureau of Transportation Act to stop at all 4545  
21 railroad grade crossings. It is all the Senate Amendment does, 4546  
22 and I urge passage." 4547

23 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur on Senate 4548  
24 Amendment #1 to House Bill 163. All in favor...the Gentleman 4549  
25 from Cook, Mr. Getty." 4550

26 Getty: "Will the Sponsor yield? Jim, are any materials deleted, 4551  
27 ah..or added, by putting in the reference to the Hazardous 4552  
28 Materials Transportation Act? I note that quite a few are set 4553  
29 out in the existing Act, and since we are changing that, I 4554  
30 wonder if..." 4555

31 VonBoeckman: "No, all that they are requiring is stop at railroad 4556  
32 crossings." 4557

33 Getty: "I'm sorry." 4559

34 VonBoeckman: "All that the Amendment does is it requires them to stop 4560  
35 at all railroad grade crossings. That's all." 4562

36 Getty: "Well, it refers to hazardous materials, as defined in this 4563



1 Act. In the present Section of the Act, it sets out liquid 4564  
2 petroleum, flammable and oxidizing liquids and solids, 4565  
3 poisonous compressed gases, volatile liquids. Now, you are 4566  
4 deleting all of that, and in deleting that, are we adding 4567  
5 something, or are we taking out something? Something that  
6 won't be covered anymore?" 4569

7 VonBoeckman: "Well, I don't know what's all in the Hazardous 4570  
8 Transportation Act. And, all the Amendment really did was to 4571  
9 put it in...make them stop at all railroad crossings." 4573

10 Getty: "I don't have any objections to their stopping at all railroad 4574  
11 crossings. That's fine. I just think we ought to know if 4575  
12 something is being deleted here that the General Assembly 4576  
13 previously said ought to be included, or, on the other hand, if 4577  
14 we are adding something else. I just think we ought to know 4578  
15 what items are covered and what aren't covered." 4579

16 VonBoeckman: "Well, I would just soon take this out of the record 4580  
17 until we get this straightened out." 4582

18 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman requests that we take this out of the 4583  
19 record. House Bill 211. Sharp." 4585

20 Sharp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move that the House 4586  
21 concur in the Senate Amendments to House Bill 211. The Bill 4587  
22 addresses the problem of transportation reimbursement for the 4588  
23 school districts and it provides for an indirect cost 4589  
24 reimbursement for administration for districts that do their 4590  
25 own busing. The Senate decided to put a limit on the amount  
26 that a district that does its own busing can include in its 4591  
27 indirect cost factor. A cap of 2.5% of the direct cost 4592  
28 associated with transportation. The fiscal impact of the Bill, 4593  
29 as it left the House, was about 2.4 million, as it came back 4594  
30 from the Senate, it's about 1.8 and I would ask for a favorable  
31 Roll Call." 4595

32 Speaker Bradley: "Discussion. Hearing none, the Gentleman moves that 4596  
33 the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4597  
34 211. All in favor, signify by voting 'aye', oppose by voting 4598  
35 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The 4599  
36 Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 155... 4600

1 156 'ayes', no 'nos'. The Bill have received the 4601  
 2 Constitutional Majority...er the House does concur in Senate 4602  
 3 Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 211. House Bill 218. The 4603  
 4 Lady by DuPage, Mrs. Dyer." 4604

5 Dyer: "Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Senate 4605  
 6 Amendment to House Bill 218 was a..was..a...merely a technical 4606  
 7 Amendment offered by the State's Attorney of Lake County which 4607  
 8 clarified the definition of convalescent homes. Ah..I would 4608  
 9 move for the adoption...I would move for the concurrence of 4609  
 10 Senate Amendment #1." 4610

11 Speaker Bradley: "The Lady moves that the House does concur in Senate 4611  
 12 Amendment #1 to House Bill 218. All in favor, signify...the 4612  
 13 Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten." 4613

14 Totten: "Mr. Speaker, could we have the...as this is final passage, 4614  
 15 could we have the..the Sponsor not only explain the Bill, but 4615  
 16 also the Amendment that we are concurring in?" 4617

17 Speaker Bradley: "Dyer." 4619

18 Dyer: "Yes, certainly. I explained the Amendment, now I will explain 4620  
 19 the Bill. The Bill, 218, which we passed overwhelmingly very 4621  
 20 early in the session, is a very simple Bill..a..a..which is 4622  
 21 designed to help solve a problem that both DuPage and Lake 4623  
 22 Counties have in connection with their convalescent homes. It 4624  
 23 makes it clear that the townships may pay to the County their 4625  
 24 share of..for patients in the home and, as I said, the 4626  
 25 Amendment is simply a technical Amendment offered as a 4627  
 26 suggestion by the State's Attorney of Lake County to make clear 4628  
 27 we are talking about convalescent homes operated by the County 4629  
 28 and not private convalescent homes." 4629

29 Speaker Bradley: "The question is, should the House concur in Senate 4630  
 30 Amendment #1 to House Bill 218. All in favor, signify by 4631  
 31 voting 'aye', oppose by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? 4632  
 32 Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On 4633  
 33 this question, there are 160 'ayes', 2 'nos' and the House does 4634  
 34 concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 218. House Bill 4635  
 35 318. I understand that...alright House Bill 326. Barnes or 4636  
 36 Mr. Madigan. House Bill 380. House Bill 420, Mr. DiPrima." 4637

1 DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move for...I move for concurrence to 4638  
2 Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 420." 4640

3 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendment 4641  
4 #1..I think somebody wants an explanation." 4643

5 DiPrima: "Well, alright then. Number one, it eliminates the 4644  
6 requirement that an eligible veteran receives an honorable 4645  
7 discharge. Don't let that throw you for a loop, 'cause this 4646  
8 Bill, you have to be missing in action, you must be drawing 4647  
9 100% disability, so you have to have an honorable discharge, so 4648  
10 that reference is meaningless. It also, it amends references 4649  
11 to the dependent child and sponsor may be either male or 4650  
12 female. It deletes the provision that the University of 4651  
13 Illinois honorary scholarships be available to children of 4652  
14 persons that have served in the armed services between January 4653  
15 1, 1961 and May 7, 1975." 4654

16 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate 4654  
17 Amendment #1 to House Bill 420. All in favor, signify by 4655  
18 voting 'aye', oppose by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? 4656  
19 Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On 4657  
20 this question, we have 155 'ayes', 2 'nos', and the House does 4658  
21 concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 420. House Bill 4659  
22 437. Cullerton-Chapman-Kelly. Out of the record. 440 out of  
23 the record. 445. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe." 4661

24 Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 455 is a 4662  
25 Bill that gave the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation 4663  
26 certain institutions to handle. They gave it to them from the 4664  
27 Department of Children and Family Services. We discussed this 4665  
28 once before. Amendment #1 merely provides that the Act takes 4666  
29 effect on July 1, 1979. Amendment #2, which we went into in 4667  
30 great detail, which Representative Getty had some problems 4668  
31 with, gave DVR the ability to have a security force that was 4669  
32 similar to DCFS under the Personnel Code. There are still some 4670  
33 problems with the way the law actually is written with regard 4671  
34 to a police and security force and who has the right to what 4672  
35 training that particular force has. However, Representative 4673  
36 Getty and I agreed that we would concur in Amendment #2 and we

1 would try to find some vehicle to straighten out the other 4673  
 2 language. That language appears in all other Statutes. It 4674  
 3 appears in the Statutes for DCFS and the other institutions, 4675  
 4 and so we are going to have to make some change in that 4676  
 5 particular language, but there's no sense in holding this Bill  
 6 up, so I would move to concur in Amendment #1 and Amendment #2 4677  
 7 to House Bill 455." 4678

8 Speaker Bradley: The Gentleman moves the House concur in Senate 4679  
 9 Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 455. The Gentleman from 4680  
 10 Cook, Mr. Wolf, on that motion." 4681

11 Wolf: "I just wanted to ask the Sponsor a question. I didn't quite 4682  
 12 get that." 4683

13 Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will yield." 4685

14 Wolf: "Does this require the consent of the natural parent yet?" 4687

15 Jaffe: "I don't know what you mean, Jake. This has nothing to do 4688  
 16 with natural parents. I think you are looking at a different 4689  
 17 Bill." 4690

18 Wolf: "It's the wrong Bill. I beg your pardon." 4692

19 Jaffe: "Okay." 4694

20 Speaker Bradley: "On the Gentleman's motion, all in favor, signify by 4695  
 21 voting 'aye', oppose by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? 4696  
 22 Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On 4697  
 23 this question, there's 154 'ayes' and 5 'nos', and the House 4698  
 24 does concur to Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 455. 4699  
 25 Let's take care of 456, Mr. Jaffe." 4700

26 Jaffe: "456 is merely a technical Amendment, Mr. Speaker. All that 4701  
 27 it does is correctly cites the chapter, paragraph reference 4702  
 28 before the text of the Bill. It's merely a technical 4703  
 29 Amendment." 4704

30 Speaker Bradley: "Discussion. The question is, shall the House 4705  
 31 concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 456. All in favor, 4706  
 32 signify by voting 'aye', oppose by voting 'no'. The Clerk will 4707  
 33 take the record. On this question, there are 153 'ayes', 1 4708  
 34 'no'. The Bill having..er..the House does concur in Senate 4709  
 35 Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 456. House Bill 493. The 4710  
 36 Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz." 4711

1 Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 4712  
 2 House. I move that the House do concur with Senate Amendment 4713  
 3 #1, which adds to the effective immediate state of the Bill. 4714  
 4 Senate Bill...House Bill 493 would require the Department of 4715  
 5 Public Aid to disregard the assets of a single person up to 4716  
 6 \$1,500 and a married person up to \$2,250 in determining 4717  
 7 eligibility for medical assistance. This measure has been  
 8 suggested primarily by senior citizens organizations, including 4718  
 9 the Council of Aging...the Department of Aging. It proposes 4719  
 10 that state standards for medical assistance eligibility 4720  
 11 parallels those which are in effect with federal supplemental  
 12 security income. And Senate Amendment #1 provides an effective 4721  
 13 immediate date. Move for its adoption." 4722

14 Speaker Bradley: "Discussion...in hearing none, the question is, 4723  
 15 shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4724  
 16 493? All in favor, signify by voting 'aye', oppose by voting 4725  
 17 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The 4726  
 18 Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 148 4727  
 19 'ayes', 13 'nos', and the House does concur with Senate  
 20 Amendment #1 to House Bill 493. House Bill 14, Mr. Daniels, on 4728  
 21 concurrence." 4729

22 Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, I would change that to move to nonconcur and 4730  
 23 ask for the appointment of a Conference Committee." 4732

24 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House is nonconcur in 4733  
 25 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 14. All in favor of the 4734  
 26 Gentleman's motion, say 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it 4735  
 27 and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House 4736  
 28 Bill 14. House Bill 522. The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. 4737  
 29 McClain." 4738

30 McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of 4739  
 31 the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to 4740  
 32 House Bill 522. All Senate Amendment #1 did was to conform the 4741  
 33 Bill to federal law on the 70 year old retirement and secondly, 4742  
 34 it stated that nothing in this Act shall conflict with 4743  
 35 contractual rights. I went over the Amendment with 4744  
 36 Representative Greiman and there's absolutely no other

1 subsistence to the Bill, except for those two issues and I 4745  
2 would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4746  
3 522." 4747

4 Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten." 4748  
5 Totten: "Would the Spons...Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor 4750  
6 yield for a question?" 4752

7 Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will." 4754  
8 Totten: "Representative McClain, as the Bill left the House, it 4755  
9 raised teacher tenure up to age 70. Is that right?" 4757

10 McClain: "No...no, that's another Bill. This just stated that 4758  
11 you...it continued contractual service to age 70. So, in other 4759  
12 words, a person could not be fired at age...mandatory 4760  
13 retirement age, 65, it just extended that to age 70." 4761

14 Totten: "It took away...then it took away from the school district 4762  
15 the right to terminate employment at 65?" 4764

16 McClain: "No, federal law mandated that...that they could not. All 4765  
17 this is...would comply with federal mandate. Secondly though, 4766  
18 this in no way would influence any contractual rights, for 4767  
19 instance, like early retirement or the option of early 4768  
20 retirement for a teacher." 4769

21 Totten: "Well, I noticed in the Digest that the Bill was passed here 4770  
22 106 to 36 and there were a lot of questions on it and my 4771  
23 recollection was that it affected...it affected the contractual 4772  
24 relationship between the school and the teacher after age 65." 4773

25 McClain: "No, actually, Mr. Totten, those questions were derived from 4775  
26 Mr. Greiman's questions and I'll be glad to defer to him 4776  
27 because the questions...the extensive questioning came mainly 4777  
28 from Mr. Greiman. Mr. Speaker, if you'd call on Mr. Greiman." 4778

29 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Greiman, the Gentleman from Cook." 4781  
30 Greiman: "Don, in this Bill...we've really heard this Bill...this is 4782  
31 the third time. I passed a Bill substantially with the same 4783  
32 things that just got caught in the Committee switches over 4784  
33 there and then a Bill came back with an Amendment...a Senate 4785  
34 Bill came over here that was Prescott Bloom's Bill that 4786  
35 Representative Bradley handled. And where we had discussed 4787  
36 essentially the same...the same issue. Federal law requires 4787

1 the...mandates the retirement at 70 or sets that as the time 4788  
 2 within which you cannot previously retire a teacher. And what 4789  
 3 happens is a lot of people would like to now retire at, you 4790  
 4 know, 66, 65, many of them 67, but the laws and the contracts  
 5 are written thus and such shall happen upon automatic 4791  
 6 retirement, which is now 70. So that many of the teachers who 4792  
 7 would like to retire at age 65 would lose benefits because they 4793  
 8 are a voluntary retirement rather than a mandatory retirement. 4794  
 9 So, it is to protect those teachers so that they don't lose 4795  
 10 rights which they all have. That's why we need this...and you  
 11 know, we...like everything, we've heard it three times. It's 4796  
 12 no different, it's no worse, it's no better than it was when it 4797  
 13 passed out each of the three...each of the two other times. I 4798  
 14 don't know anything about the rest of the Bill. I'm just 4799  
 15 talking about the Amendment." 4800

16 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman." 4802

17 Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. One question of the 4803  
 18 Sponsor related to comments which were made by the...just 4804  
 19 concluded speaker. Does the federal law in fact mandate on 4805  
 20 local school districts the age 70 or does that law just apply 4806  
 21 to federal employees?" 4807

22 Speaker Bradley: "Turn Mr. McClain on." 4809

23 McClain: "It's for all, Mr. Hoffman. All." 4811

24 Hoffman: "The federal law applies to all governmental employees, 4812  
 25 regardless of the level?" 4814

26 McClain: "Yes, Sir. All employees." 4816

27 Hoffman: "All right, thank you very much. I wasn't aware that the 4817  
 28 application of the federal increase of the mandatory age 4818  
 29 limitation applied to anything other than federal workers." 4820

30 McClain: "Thank you." 4822

31 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle." 4824

32 Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. The federal law does indeed 4825  
 33 apply to public employees as were questioned here. The only 4826  
 34 exemption, in fact, is certain people who are designated under 4827  
 35 the federal law who are very high paid employees of certain 4828  
 36 university systems. That's the only one that's exempted out. 4829

1 Representative Greiman and McClain are right." 4830

2 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Adams moves that the House does 4831  
3 concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 522. All in favor 4832  
4 of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by 4833  
5 voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who 4834  
6 wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there 4835  
7 are 154 'aye'...155 'aye', 5 'no' and the House does concur in 4836  
8 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 155(sic). To make, to  
9 clarify a point for Mr. Daniels. When he moved to nonconcur 4837  
10 and asked for a Conference Committee, that won't take place 4838  
11 then because the Senate could recede or refuse to recede on 4839  
12 your Amendment. And...then we might end up in a Conference 4840  
13 Committee. It's the same as Senate Bills on Nonconcurrency on  
14 our Calendar, whether we recede or refuse to recede before a 4841  
15 Conference Committee takes place. House Bill 524. The 4842  
16 Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff. Mr. Huff back there? House 4843  
17 Bill 604. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle". 4844

18 Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Senate Amendment merely clarifies the 4845  
19 intent of the Bill as we passed it from the House to indicate 4846  
20 that the probation period provided for in the Bill would not 4847  
21 affect any employee newly hired in the university system as a 4848  
22 police employee until after the effective date of the Act and I 4849  
23 move to concur in the Senate Amendment." 4850

24 Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The question is, shall...on the 4851  
25 Gentleman's motion. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion 4852  
26 signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all 4853  
27 voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take 4854  
28 the record. On this question, there are 155 'aye', no 'nos' 4855  
29 and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill  
30 604." Page 5 of the Calendar on Second Reading, appears 4856  
31 House...er..Senate Bill 1331. Read the Bill a second time." 4858

32 Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1331. A Bill for an Act to amend the 4859  
33 Unemployment Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. 4860  
34 Amendment #1 adopted in Committee." 4861

35 Speaker Bradley: "Any motion relative to Amendment #1?" 4863

36 Clerk Leone: "No motion filed." 4865



- 1 Speaker Bradley: "Further Amendments." 4867
- 2 Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Deuster. Amends Senate Bill 1331 on page 4868  
3 11 in line 32, by inserting and so forth." 4870
- 4 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster. Mr. Deuster 4871  
5 is not on the floor. Mr. McPike, you wish to move ahead? 4872  
6 Further Amendments. What purpose does the Gentleman from 4873  
7 Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman arise?" 4874
- 8 Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, by a previous arrangement with 4875  
9 Representative Deuster, he had planned to yield to me on this 4876  
10 Amendment, on Amendment #2, to handle it and I'd be pleased to 4877  
11 do so if you care to allow that." 4878
- 12 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane. Mr. Kane." 4879
- 13 Kane: "Mr. Speaker, previously, I requested the same consideration 4881  
14 and it was..." 4882
- 15 Speaker Bradley: "I think our...I think our problem has been solved. 4883  
16 Mr. Deuster is arrived. I would rule it the same way though. 4884  
17 Mr. Deuster on Amendment #2. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. 4885  
18 Giorgi. What purpose do you rise?" 4886
- 19 Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker. While he's getting his books in order, I have 4887  
20 an announcement to make. The record should show that 4888  
21 Representative, Representative Dan Pierce is excused because of 4889  
22 the death of his father and his secretary called me and told me 4890  
23 that the services would be tomorrow at 2:00 at Piser Chapel in 4891  
24 Skokie, Illinois, at 9200 North Skokie and in lieu of flowers,  
25 they'd suggest contributing to cancer research." 4893
- 26 Speaker Bradley: "Mr., Mr. Giorgi. Thank you, if you would repeat 4894  
27 that again. I don't think everybody..." 4896
- 28 Giorgi: "The record should show that Representative Dan Pierce is 4897  
29 absent because of the death of his father and that the services 4898  
30 will be tomorrow at 2:00 at Piser Chapel in Skokie. And in 4899  
31 lieu of flowers, they suggest contributing to your favorite 4900  
32 cancer research unit." 4901
- 33 Speaker Bradley: "Thank you. Mr. Deuster on Amendment #2." 4903
- 34 Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to Representative 4904  
35 Schuneman for the presentation of Amendment #2." 4906
- 36 Speaker Bradley "Mr. Schuneman. Gentleman from Whiteside." 4908

1 Schuneman: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. For those Members who are  
2 interested in making some changes in unemployment compensation  
3 insurance for the State of Illinois, I hope that you will give  
4 this Amendment your attention. The Amendment seeks to clarify  
5 the Unemployment Compensation Act by providing that  
6 unemployment compensation claims will only be paid when the  
7 unemployment results from a cause which is attributable to the  
8 employer. The Preamble to our Unemployment Compensation Act  
9 states that the purpose of the Act is to help those employees  
10 who are involuntarily unemployed. In fact, the present law  
11 says that an individual shall be ineligible for benefits for  
12 the week in which he has left work voluntarily without good  
13 cause. The problem is that the Department of Labor has  
14 interpreted that good cause provision in a very liberal manner  
15 and this Legislature has, in past years, adopted pro-union  
16 changes so that employers are now required to pay claims in  
17 many instances where the employee simply doesn't want to work  
18 anymore. Employers are required to pay in instances where the  
19 employee simply quits to follow his spouse to another job or  
20 the employee may not like his employer and they can't get along  
21 together and therefore, he quits. Then instances of where  
22 employees have quit to go back to Mexico or Puerto Rico for  
23 visits and come back to this country and are eligible for  
24 unemployment compensation. Instances where employees quit  
25 their employer and go to the Sun Belt and you know the stories  
26 about sending unemployment compensation checks to those other  
27 states. The Legislature liberalized the benefits a few years  
28 ago so that now employers have to pay employees who refuse to  
29 work because of their unwillingness to cross a picket line.  
30 This Amendment would simply re-state the original intent of the  
31 Unemployment Compensation Act and would make benefits available  
32 only to those who are involuntarily unemployed. I'd like to  
33 suggest to you that if Senate Bill 1331 passes without this  
34 Amendment, the annual contributions by the business community  
35 in Illinois will increase by something like \$180,000,000 per  
36 year. And, I think we should not pass this Bill. Increasing

1 the benefits and increasing the cost until we close some of the 4940  
 2 ridiculous loop holes that have been put into our unemployment  
 3 compensation benefit system. And, I would urge the adoption of 4941  
 4 this Amendment, which says that unemployment insurance claims 4942  
 5 will only be allowable if the cause for unemployment is one 4943  
 6 attributable to the employer. And I would urge your support of 4944  
 7 this Amendment." 4945

8 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike." 4947

9 McPike: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I 4948  
 10 think that we should be aware of the full implications of the 4949  
 11 votes on this Amendment and on every following Amendment. When 4950  
 12 I came to Springfield two and a half years ago, one thing was 4951  
 13 very evident both on the House floor and in the general 4952  
 14 carriage of every politician here. And that is your word is 4953  
 15 your bond. When you shake hands. When you agree. That's it.  
 16 When you sit down and negotiate in good faith and you come to a 4954  
 17 compromise and that's what you go with. When you give your 4955  
 18 word, you live up with it. And that's what has happened this 4956  
 19 year. Organized labor was very reluctant to sit down at the 4957  
 20 bargaining table, but they did so. They negotiated across that  
 21 table in good faith. One of the provisions that Management 4958  
 22 insisted upon was Amendment #2. Management insisted on it and 4959  
 23 insisted on it and insisted on it. And Labor said 'No, no, 4960  
 24 no!. Finally, Labor said this; the current penalty for 4961  
 25 voluntary quit, the current penalty for discharge for  
 26 misconduct is six weeks or eight weeks, whatever it is, 'We'll 4962  
 27 go to twelve weeks and not only that, we will make a provision 4963  
 28 in there that will say that you have to work or that you have 4964  
 29 to earn six times your weekly benefit amount before you're 4965  
 30 qualified again. We will make this concession if you  
 31 Management will drop your insistence on this provision'. The 4966  
 32 Management said yes. You give and we'll give and that's how 4967  
 33 the bargaining went back and forth for some three or four 4969  
 34 weeks until a final agreement was worked out. Now, one of the  
 35 members of that nine member Committee was from the Illinois 4970  
 36 Manufacturers Association. In fact, the member was the 4971

1 Chairman of the Unem...of the Illinois Manufacturers 4972  
 2 Association Statewide Unemployment Insurance Committee. He  
 3 agreed to this. He testified next to me in Committee that he 4973  
 4 agreed to this and that he was in opposition to this Amendment 4974  
 5 and to any Amendment." 4975

6 Speaker Bradley: "What purpose does the...Just a minute, sir. What 4976  
 7 purpose does the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, arise?" 4978

8 Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we have an awful lot of business left to 4979  
 9 do. I'd like to hear what his objections are to this 4980  
 10 Amendment, not a dialogue and a bunch of clap trap about his 4981  
 11 feelings about any deals that may have been made. We're 4982  
 12 interested in the, in the Amendment." 4983

13 Speaker Bradley: "Continue, Mr. McPike, on the Amendment." 4985

14 McPike: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Obviously, some people on the House 4986  
 15 floor do not have as much respect for an agreement as others 4987  
 16 do. I, myself, think that an agreement reached across the 4988  
 17 table, bargaining in good faith, shaking hands as an agreed 4989  
 18 Bill should be,...should be just that and nothing more. We are 4990  
 19 now posturing ourselves to change what has been an agreement  
 20 between Management and Labor. We are posturing ourselves to go 4991  
 21 back on the process, that is, when the Leadership and when the 4992  
 22 Governor says sit down and bargain in good faith and we will 4993  
 23 honor your agreement, we are now saying no. Well, not everyone 4994  
 24 in the state has said that. The Chamber of Commerce do believe  
 25 that honorable people should live up to their word and Labor 4995  
 26 believes likewise. And they in their latest bulletin, along 4996  
 27 with the Governor, have asked us to support this Bill without 4997  
 28 any Amendments. The reasons given for adopting this Amendment 4998  
 29 hold very little weight to begin with. We have, today, a 4999  
 30 system that is operating better than it has in many years.  
 31 Last year, there were 43,000 disqualifications for voluntary 5000  
 32 leave and some of the examples that the Sponsor of the 5001  
 33 Amendment gave for qualifying are simply not true. If you quit 5002  
 34 because you don't like your work, or if you quit because you 5003  
 35 don't like your foreman, you're not going to receive a good  
 36 cause quit. That is not considered good cause. 43,000 people 5004

1 were disqualified for that last year. Under today's system, one 5005  
 2 out of three people that are applying for unemployment 5006  
 3 insurance are being disqualified or denied those benefits. We 5007  
 4 have a system in effect now that is working. We are trying to  
 5 move to make some constructive changes. According to business, 5008  
 6 the first constructive changes made in the last six years were 5009  
 7 in doing so with agreement of all parties involved that sat in 5010  
 8 on the agreed Bill process. For...Because the Amendment itself 5011  
 9 does not carry weight and because of the process that went 5012  
 10 behind it, I would move for its defeat." 5013

11 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk." 5015

12 Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I heard the previous 5016  
 13 speaker and I know what he speaks. He's talking about the 5017  
 14 agreed Bill process. Those of you that have been here for any 5018  
 15 number of years realize that I have been a proponent of the 5019  
 16 return to the agreed Bill process in the area of UI and 5020  
 17 Workman's Comp. I have had some discussions with the various  
 18 people who have sat in on the bargaining for this Bill, Senate 5021  
 19 Bill 1331. They seem to be awfully distressed of the fact that 5022  
 20 the General Assembly is now taking what they consider to be a 5023  
 21 flexible position relative to the agreed Bill process. But, I 5024  
 22 remind those people and I'd remind the majority of the Members 5025  
 23 seated in this room today, that there aren't too many people 5026  
 24 serving in the General Assembly that understand the agreed Bill  
 25 process as it once functioned. And, as it once functioned 5027  
 26 properly and well for the whole State of Illinois. It's been 5028  
 27 many, many years since we've had an agreed Bill process. It is 5029  
 28 true that Management and Labor sat down on this particular 5030  
 29 issue and came to an agreement and it's true that generally 5031  
 30 speaking, the agreement should be honored. However, there  
 31 aren't many Members and I repeat myself, there aren't many 5032  
 32 Members that understand the agreed Bill process and, therefore, 5033  
 33 when a Bill comes out to the chamber, either the House or the 5034  
 34 Senate, the people who are now serving feel that they have a 5035  
 35 right to amend the Bill. And, they do have a right. Now,  
 36 whether you agree with that concept or not, the problem is...is 5036

1 getting the people who are participating in the agreed Bill 503  
 2 process and getting the Members who are now serving, in affect, 5038  
 3 educated to the idea that there will be some agreement in these 5039  
 4 areas, these are very important areas through the State of 5040  
 5 Illinois to the point where the General Assembly can accept  
 6 what is agreed upon. Now the people met for three weeks. They 5041  
 7 did come up with some changes. All of us aren't happy with all 5042  
 8 the changes, but I understand the rules of the game, so to 5043  
 9 speak, but I'm also understanding enough to know that each 5044  
 10 Member has a right to offer an Amendment and in this case, what  
 11 Representative Schuneman is doing, is offering an Amendment to 5045  
 12 strengthen the Bill, and frankly, I would support the Amendment 5046  
 13 even though I support the agreed Bill in concept." 5048

14 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan." 5050

15 Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Gentleman is 5051  
 16 talking about those people who may not understand what use to 5052  
 17 take place and is commonly called the agreed Bill process. I 5053  
 18 happen to be one of those legislators that's been here long 5054  
 19 enough to remember it well. And, I remember it well enough to 5055  
 20 say to those Members here, I didn't like it. I sat in the same  
 21 role that some conservative Members of this House are now going 5056  
 22 to sit in, in having to almost accept what somebody else did in 5057  
 23 my behalf and told me how to vote. I didn't particularly like 5058  
 24 it, but I had to accept it because that was the system. It's 5059  
 25 just going to be like on June 30, it's going to happen here in 5060  
 26 this House when the Roll Call takes place and all the ducks are 5061  
 27 lined up and everyone's going to get their shot at voting for  
 28 a transportation package. You may not like it, but there'll be 5062  
 29 89 or 90 votes put up on the board and some people will walk 5063  
 30 and some people will cry and some people will moan, but you'll 5064  
 31 accept it. And the people of Illinois will also. The fact 5065  
 32 that remains is that the agreed process is not necessarily the 5066  
 33 best process, but it's the only game in town today. And that's 5067  
 34 the thing that you got to think about when you're voting on  
 35 these Amendments. If the failure of the very first attempt to 5068  
 36 have an agreed Bill moved through the General Assembly fails 5069

1 because of somebody's personal desire to add to what an agreed 507  
2 Bill says, if this takes place, then you will have to shoulder 507  
3 the responsibility down the years to come of a failure to come 507  
4 to grips when an agreement that pertains to peoples' futures, 507  
5 business communities, economic development, and all other kinds 507  
6 of aspects of, of labor relations that will take place in the 507  
7 future years in Illinois. Now, when somebody at first 507  
8 suggested that an agreed process Bill be reinstated in this  
9 State, I was one of the first to say, 'Bologna'. I wouldn't 507  
10 tolerate it, nor would I accept it. But, being a reasonable 507  
11 person in some ways reasonable enough to say, 'Alright, let's 507  
12 listen to what the arguments are. Let's hear it for all the 508  
13 Wikoffs, and the Schunemans, and the Tuerks, and all the Bills  
14 that were introduced over the years. If these Members' ideas 508  
15 could weather an agreed process situation and now because they 508  
16 couldn't, now because they didn't have the validity behind 508  
17 them. Now because when they were scrutinized, not by people 508  
18 with an ax to grind, not by people who have to vote for  
19 re-election or stand to test the re-election, but by an actual, 508  
20 actuarially accountable method of sitting down and hammering out 508  
21 of what you're going to do to the Unemployment Compensation Act 508  
22 by imposing certain Amendments to it. Just factually, these 508  
23 men, these nine people, sat down and come up with an agreed 508  
24 process Bill. Now, if you want to turn that around and say  
25 that you have something to offer that is far and beyond what 509  
26 they have come up and agreed to, I say to you that you're 509  
27 asking to show their responsibility that is horrendous to live 509  
28 by. Because you're going to find in your business community  
29 and in your Trade Union membership in your communities that 509  
30 they're going to resent the fact that after people who have an 509  
31 intimate, detailed knowledge of the true facts of unemployment 509  
32 compensation and how it affects and interwinds with the Federal 509  
33 Act and how it affects the economic development of this state. 509  
34 You're going to find that you're going to should a  
35 responsibility. You're not going to be able to stand up in 509  
36 your district and say you knew more about the Unemployment 509

1 Compensation Act than the nine participants in the agreed Bill 5100  
 2 process that undertook this evaluation. I suggest to you, it 5101  
 3 may have some merit, Representative Schuneman, in your  
 4 Amendment and certainly there is some emotional support in 5102  
 5 behind all the Amendments that have been offered. There's 5103  
 6 without a doubt, that all of them are meaningful to the 5104  
 7 individual Sponsors and maybe to some Members of the House, but  
 8 I think there's a greater process that we have to look at and 5105  
 9 that's the process that if you sit down and negotiate out a 5106  
 10 contract, that you can't play like a Monday morning quarterback 5107  
 11 to say what should have been done or how the play should have 5108  
 12 been maneuvered. You have to someday sit down and accept the 5109  
 13 responsibility of being a Legislator that says for the overall  
 14 good of this state, we will accept, once we have entered into 5110  
 15 the agreement, whatever the process brought out. And the 5111  
 16 processes brought out, the amended Bill, Senate Bill 1331. And 5112  
 17 for somebody now to shoulder, put it upon their shoulder to 5113  
 18 take a chance and amend that process at this late date, I think  
 19 you will regret and you're rue today, because I could only 5115  
 20 foresee a failure of any agreement in Workman's Comp., 5116  
 21 Unemployment Comp, minimum wage, prevailing rate, prevailing  
 22 wage and the myraid of labor relation laws that have on the 5117  
 23 state of ever sitting down in the future in good faith because 5118  
 24 there's one word that has to be lived up to, and that's the 5119  
 25 word of integrity. And, the integrity of the process cannot be 5120  
 26 distorted by some well meaning Legislator thinking that he has 5121  
 27 an idea that's more important than this agreement. As for me,  
 28 I urge a 'no' vote even though some of you may have some 5122  
 29 sympathy with the ideas that are proposed in the Amendment. I 5123  
 30 suggest that a 'no' vote would be a better idea at this time." 5124

31 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Birkinbine." 5127  
 32 Birkinbine: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 5128  
 33 House. I draw your attention to 1331 as it's shown in the 5129  
 34 Legislative Synopsis and Digest and you'll see that already 5130  
 35 this Bill has five Senate Amendments and one House Amendment. 5131  
 36 The talk for the last 15 or 20 minutes has been as though we're 5132



talking a virgin Bill that no Amendments on it whatsoever. 5133  
 This Bill is already littered with Amendments. Up until now,  
 we haven't had the most important one facing us. This, 5134  
 Amendment #2 that's offered, makes the difference between this 5135  
 being a Bill that is palliatable to some of business and a Bill 5136  
 that is totally objectionable and one that anyone with any kind 5137  
 of support for local business in their area could support. 5138  
 Now, I for one, have not found a single company in my district 5139  
 that says they can go along with this as is. I suspect that's  
 the same for a great many people throughout the state. I am 5140  
 also one who has had a great many companies, indeed, some of 5141  
 the school districts in my district say we have got to change 5142  
 this situation. The school districts find teachers who 5143  
 voluntarily quit either to go to another state, another 5144  
 district, or to follow a spouse, are unable to find work in  
 that other district, or other state. They apply for 5145  
 unemployment comp. here in Illinois and Illinois gladly gives 5146  
 it. The same thing happens with company after company. I 5147  
 suggest that you put yourself in the position of an employer 5148  
 who has somebody voluntarily quit and that's what we're talking  
 about. Somebody who quits because of no fault of your own or 5149  
 your company. They then apply for unemployment comp. and you 5150  
 have to pay. Now, I suggest to you, I suggest to the Sponsor 5151  
 of the Bill that if this Amendment does not pass, the Bill 5152  
 itself probably does not have the snowballs chance in hell of 5153  
 ever getting through and if anything, it's going to sit on one  
 groups lap. So, I suggest a favorable vote for this Amendment. 5154  
 I repeat again, that it is the one Amendment that employers of 5155  
 this state have been looking for with regard to unemployment 5156  
 compensation. Thank you." 5157

31 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow." 5159

32 Darrow: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question." 5161

33 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman moves the previous question. All in 5162  
 34 favor of the Gentleman's motion, signify by saying 'aye', 516  
 35 oppose 'no'. The 'ayes'...All in favor of the Gentleman's 516  
 36 motion, vote 'aye' and oppose vote 'no'. Previous question. 516

1 Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. 87 5165  
2 'ayes', 61 'nays' and the motion fails. Gentleman from 5166  
3 Champaign, Mr. Wikoff." 5167  
4 Wikoff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I have one 5168  
5 question from the Sponsor and then I would like to address the 5169  
6 Bill if I may." 5170  
7 Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he yield." 5172  
8 Wikoff: "Representative..." 5174  
9 Speaker Bradley: "Of the Amendment, or of the Bill?" 5176  
10 Wikoff: "On the Amendment. On..." 5178  
11 Speaker Bradley: "On the Amendment?" 5180  
12 Wikoff: "On the Amendment." 5182  
13 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schuneman." 5184  
14 Wikoff: "I...I'm sorry. My question is to Representative McPike and 5185  
15 then I'd like to address the Amendment." 5187  
16 Speaker Bradley: "Well, I think we're on the Amendment, we're not on 5188  
17 the Bill. If you have a question of the Amendment, you should 5189  
18 address it to the Sponsor of the Amendment." 5191  
19 Wikoff: "Okay. Alright. Well, that we can handle. I...I haven't 5192  
20 been here too long and this is about the first time that we 5193  
21 have seen the agreed Bill process and I would hope somebody 5194  
22 that was here a little bit longer than I have would explain 5195  
23 what may have happened to the agreed Bill process back in 1975. 5196  
24 It was mentioned earlier that we should agree and accept what 5197  
25 had been negotiated by some other individuals. Well, I've had 5198  
26 a little experience in some negotiating Committees, as I'm sure 5199  
27 some other people in the audience have had, and there's been 5200  
28 more than once during those negotiations that once these were 5201  
29 taken back to the Membership for ratification that they were 5201  
30 not ratified and then we went back to start all over again. 5202  
31 And I would feel that if we have an agreed Bill process, that 5203  
32 the Representatives should have some input into that agreed 5204  
33 Bill and I think this is what we're trying to do now. I think 5205  
34 what Representative Schuneman is proposed in this Amendment is 5206  
35 one of what would make a, what is presently is a disagreeable 5207  
36 Bill, quite acceptable among all of us, because I'm sure that 5207

1 I'm not the only one in this House chambers that one of his  
2 biggest complaints is from the employer, both small and large,  
3 that somebody left my employee and is now drawing unemployment  
4 and I can't do anything about it. There's been a lot of  
5 comments made that this is going to be good for the small  
6 employer. I'd like to read just a couple three figures here  
7 and please pay attention, because I won't take very long. You  
8 know I never spend too much time up here. A company with four  
9 employees. One employee claim against them in each of three  
10 successive years under the Bill, as it is presently amended.  
11 Somebody walks off involuntarily. His cost per employee is  
12 \$180. Under the law, under the Bill, as it is presently before  
13 us without the Amendment those will go to \$196. A company with  
14 seven employees with the same conditions, his present costs are  
15 \$183 per employee. This is assuming he might even be at the  
16 bottom of the very totem pole and one employee decides to walk  
17 off. His costs are \$183 per employee. Under the...this Bill  
18 as it is presently before us, unamended, they will go to \$211.  
19 That company has ten employees and the same circumstances  
20 happen he's going to be, he's going to be paying \$200 per  
21 employee. Under the new Bill, it's going to go for \$245 which  
22 is over a 20% increase. I don't think any of us are  
23 complaining about the unemployment compensation Bill for what  
24 it is supposed to do, but this is one of the Amendments, in  
25 fact, probably the only Amendment that is going to create and  
26 solve some of the blatant abuses that have been put forth on  
27 this Bill. I think without this Amendment that this Bill  
28 should go down the defeat and I urge the adoption of this  
29 Amendment."

30 Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from...Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr.  
31 Giorgi. The chair would like to make a point here. We're  
32 talking about everything but the Gentleman's Amendment. We're  
33 talking about the Bill. We're not debating the Bill. I've  
34 been pretty lenient on it. I think we've got a number of  
35 people that want to talk on the issue, but if we're going to  
36 talk, let's, you know, address the Amendment. We've let a

1 number on both sides go, adrift afar and we'd like to stick 523  
2 with the Amendment. Alright, Mr. Vinson? Mr. Mulcahey, what 524  
3 purpose do you rise?" 524  
4 Mulcahey: "Point of information, Mr. Speaker. How many Amendments 524  
5 are there to this Bill?" 524  
6 Speaker Bradley: "How many Amendments?" 524  
7 Mulcahey: "Yes, sir." 524  
8 Speaker Bradley: "How many Amendments. 14 Amendments." 525  
9 Mulcahey: "14. Thank you." 525  
10 Speaker Bradley: "Alright. Alright. Now, on the, on the Amendment, 525  
11 the Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino." 525  
12 Mautino: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the 525  
13 House. I think when we address amend...whether it's Amendment 525  
14 #1 or Amendment #2, all the way through Amendment #14, what 525  
15 we're doing is addressing the question of the agreed Bill 525  
16 process and I don't think there's anybody in this House that 526  
17 caught any more heat than I did during the last two and a half 526  
18 Sessions on unemployment comp. and workman's compensation. 526  
19 What I can't understand, what I can't understand is how we can 526  
20 go around the State of Illinois campaigning that the problems 526  
21 that were caused in workman's compensation, unemployment 526  
22 compensation came about because there was no agreed Bill 526  
23 process. Now you're addressing the agreed Bill process that 526  
24 has been endorsed by the Chamber of Commerce, the Governor's 526  
25 Task Force and of course, Labor, who was sitting at that table, 526  
26 as well as three independent citizens that have agreed to this. 526  
27 If you are about to wreck the agreed Bill process, please do 526  
28 not go around the State of Illinois in your campaigning that 526  
29 the reason we don't have any changes or corrections in 527  
30 workman's compensation is because we did not have the agreed 527  
31 Bill process. This is it right now. Amendment #2 through 527  
32 Amendment #14 will gut the agreed Bill process and probably 527  
33 there would be nothing coming up addressing the question of 527  
34 workman's compensation. So, if you want to do that, General 527  
35 Assembly, go ahead. Then we'll have the pendulum swing again 527  
36 and we'll be addressing on an individual basis what happens to 527

1 workman's compensation and we'll be back in a great spectrum 5277  
 2 that none of us can handle. I recommend you do not adopt the 5278  
 3 Amendments 2 through 14, and we live up to the agreement that 5279  
 4 was put forth by the Governor's Task Force, Labor, Management, 5280  
 5 and private citizens." 5281

6 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane." 5283

7 Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I would move the previous question." 5285

8 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman moves the previous question. All in 5286  
 9 favor of the Gentleman's motion, signify by saying 'aye', 5287  
 10 oppose 'no'. In the opinion of the chair, the 'ayes' have it. 5288  
 11 Mr. Schuneman to close the debate." 5289

12 Schuneman: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of 5290  
 13 the House. We've heard a lot of conversation this afternoon 5291  
 14 about the agreed Bill process. Well, when I came into this 5292  
 15 Legislature in 1975, I didn't hear much about the agreed 5293  
 16 process. I heard Members from the other side of the aisle 5294  
 17 standing over there saying 'We don't need you. We're going to 5295  
 18 pass this Bill without you'. And you did. You did it. 234  
 19 and 235 and you're still paying for that on that side of the 5296  
 20 aisle. I suggest to you that it's time to put some reasonable 5297  
 21 changes back into the Unemployment Compensation Act. Since 5298  
 22 those Bills were passed in 1975, the Unemployment Compensation 5299  
 23 Trust Fund has gone to an over \$900,000,000 deficit. Now, 5300  
 24 we've got to do something about that that and that's part of 5301  
 25 what is addressed in this agreed Bill process. But, there's 5302  
 26 one thing that was not addressed here and there's one interest 5303  
 27 that was not considered here. And that's the small employers 5304  
 28 in Illinois. They didn't sit down with the union bosses and 5304  
 29 the managers of our very large industries in Illinois. They 5305  
 30 were not a part of this agreed Bill process. And they're the 5306  
 31 ones that would have the most to benefit from this particular 5306  
 32 Amendment. Those are the people who, when they have an 5307  
 33 employee quit them and find out that a claim has been filed 5308  
 34 against them, they assume that they're going to get fair 5309  
 35 treatment from the State of Illinois. And they're shocked when 5309  
 36 they find out that they don't get it. They need this kind of 5310

1 an Amendment. An Amendment that says our compensation system 5311  
 2 is available to those people who are rightfully unemployed. 5312  
 3 Who are involuntarily employed. But, is not available to 5313  
 4 people to want to rip-off our system. And that's what this is 5314  
 5 all about. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the Amendment that has 5315  
 6 been the subject of editorials in the Chicago Tribune and in 5316  
 7 our own Springfield Journal-Register and other newspapers 5317  
 8 papers throughout the state. It's the responsibility of this 5318  
 9 Legislature to enact unemployment compensation laws and it's 5319  
 10 our responsibility to represent the small employers throughout 5319  
 11 this state and it's our responsibility to make this system fair  
 12 and I would urge the adoption of this Amendment. And, Mr. 5320  
 13 Speaker, I would like to respectfully ask for a Roll Call on 5321  
 14 this vote please." 5322

15 Speaker Bradley: "We're going to get a Roll Call. Question's on the 5323  
 16 Gentleman's motion. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion 5324  
 17 will signify by voting 'aye', oppose by voting 'no'. The Lady 5325  
 18 from Cook, Miss Pullen, to explain her vote for one minute." 5327

19 Pullen: "Thanks alot." 5329

20 Speaker Bradley: "Miss Pullen." 5331

21 Pullen: "This Amendment is for the purpose of restoring just a little 5332  
 22 bit of fairness to the unemployment insurance system, which is 5333  
 23 supposed to be to benefit employees who lose their jobs through 5334  
 24 no fault or decision of their own. This Amendment says that is 5335  
 25 what an unemployment insurance is for. And for those who are 5336  
 26 concerned about the agreed Bill process, I would like to remind 5337  
 27 you who brought about this so-called agreed Bill. It was the 5338  
 28 man on the second floor who has all kinds of agreements these 5339  
 29 days, and if we all go along with his agreements just because 5340  
 30 he made them, some of us won't be here again next year. I urge 5341  
 31 you all to vote 'aye' for this Amendment. Let's amend this 5342  
 32 Bill into a good Bill, not just one that he agreed to. Thank 5343  
 33 you." 5343

34 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, to explain 5344  
 35 his vote." 5345

36 Matijevich: "In explaining my vote, only to remind the Sponsor of 5346

1 this Amendment the agreed process did work until 1971. It 5347  
 2 worked effectively. And it was then that Governor Ogilvie was 5348  
 3 Governor, you had both Houses with a Republican majority and 5349  
 4 Senator Arrington and the Governor helped to kill the agreed 5350  
 5 Bill process. That's what brought about 1975. We don't...We 5351  
 6 think that we should return to that agreed Bill process. If we 5352  
 7 don't do it now on this issue in workman's comp., forget about 5353  
 8 the agreed Bill process. You all know that McPike has control 5354  
 9 of this Bill. It has some improvements for you. You know that 5355  
 10 if you accept these Amendments, he'll kill the Bill. Who are 5356  
 11 you trying to fool? We must vote 'no' on this Amendment.  
 12 Support your Governor, the Chamber of Commerce, and let IMA 5357  
 13 swim by themselves for awhile." 5358

14 Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Hallstrom." 5359

15 Hallstrom: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentle..." 5361

16 Speaker Bradley: "Mrs. Hallstrom. Turn her..." 5363

17 Hallstrom: "I'm trying. Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and 5364  
 18 Gentlemen of the House. I'm voting 'yes' for this Amendment 5365  
 19 because I believe it's fair. I do not want to be intimidated 5366  
 20 by the fact that I am not agreeing with the agreed Bill 5367  
 21 process. The only thing I agreed to when I came down here was 5368  
 22 to actually try to do what my constituents want. My 5369  
 23 constituents overwhelmingly want this kind of Amendment because 5370  
 24 it's fair. And I urge more green lights. Thank you." 5371

25 Speaker Bradley: "Request for some pictures to be taken by the Peoria 5372  
 26 Journal Register. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, to 5373  
 27 explain his vote." 5374

28 Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think we need a little background, 5375  
 29 although there has been some here, and I'll try to be brief. 5376  
 30 But let me remind the Members of the House that the Speaker of 5377  
 31 this House of Representatives, in conjunction with the 5378  
 32 President of the Senate, employed the Governor that he convene 5379  
 33 a meeting of business and labor for the purpose of trying to 5380  
 34 arrange an agreed Bill on unemployment compensation. And, the 5381  
 35 Governor did that. And the Committee sat down and they worked 5382  
 36 on an arrangement which should have been, and normally have 5383

1           been acceptable to the House and the Senate. But lo and 5383  
 2           behold, there are now those who served on the Committee who are 5384  
 3           unhappy with the negotiations. And it seems to me that if  
 4           we're looking towards the future, and certainly we must be. We 5385  
 5           must not be looking at a single Amendment or any one of these 5386  
 6           14 or to this Bill. We must be looking towards the future of 5387  
 7           unemployment compensation benefits and workman's compensation 5388  
 8           benefits and what it will do to the business climate and  
 9           thereby affecting Labor and Management." 5390

10   Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Sangamon, Mrs. Oblinger." 5392

11   Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I feel 5393  
 12           that I'm being taken for a ride here. I'm told that this is an 5394  
 13           agreed Bill and I look in here and find out there's already six 5395  
 14           Amendments on it. If there's an agreed Bill, why are these 5396  
 15           Amendments on it? I can't understand that. We aren't supposed 5397  
 16           to do it here, but it's alright to do it over in the Senate. I 5398  
 17           don't understand why we have two kinds of standards." 5399

18   Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 5400  
 19           The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote." 5401

20   Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, look over this direction a little more often. 5403  
 21           Number one, I was elected to represent about 200,000 people. I 5404  
 22           knew nothing about an agreement by the Governor and the labor 5405  
 23           leaders and the business leaders. That's not my business. My 5406  
 24           business is to represent my own people and if they would expect 5407  
 25           me to do something I expect to do it. I might point out the 5408  
 26           one reason I would vote for this Amendment amongst others that 5409  
 27           I've heard here is to help stop a few gentlemen I know of from  
 28           taking their vacations at our expense in Florida every year, 5410  
 29           because I run into them every year and that's a hellava note." 5411

30   Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, to explain his 5413  
 31           vote." 5414

32   Dunn: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the 5415  
 33           House. I just wanted to indicate my support for this Amendment 5416  
 34           in light of all the circumstances we have balanced between the 5417  
 35           Legislative and Executive Branches of Government. We have a 5418  
 36           close majority here in this chamber. There are no better 5419



1 circumstances in which the agreed Bill process ought to operate 5420  
 2 and for that process to operate, to operate well and  
 3 successfully, and to have one party to that process back out 5421  
 4 and try to upset the agreed Bill that came out of that 5422  
 5 negotiated process, I think is contemptible and I hope this 5423  
 6 Amendment is soundly defeated and all others like it. I vote  
 7 'no'." 5424

8 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell, to explain 5425  
 9 his vote." 5426

10 Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 5427  
 11 I was here when the agreed Bill process was in effect and it 5428  
 12 worked reasonably well. But, I'll tell you something about 5429  
 13 this agreed Bill. This agreed Bill is give and take and it's 5430  
 14 damn little, it's all give and no take. And I think it's bad 5431  
 15 and I think this Amendment should be adopted." 5432

16 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer, to 5433  
 17 explain his vote." 5434

18 Brummer: "In explaining my 'no' vote, I have been told by some of my 5435  
 19 colleagues on this side of the aisle that I listen to the 5436  
 20 Chamber of Commerce too frequently. I received a letter from 5437  
 21 the Chamber of Commerce asking me to resist all Amendments on 5438  
 22 this Bill. This is an important Bill. This was a Bill that 5439  
 23 was agreed to and I think we ought to abide by that agreement  
 24 in compliance with the wishes of the Chamber of Commerce. I'm 5440  
 25 voting 'no'." 5441

26 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis." 5443

27 Davis: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker. Let me just say this. A lot of 5444  
 28 egos seem to be involved in this today on who's agreed Bill it 5445  
 29 is, but any agreement, Ladies and Gentlemen, that produces a 5446  
 30 sizeable tax increase on business in this climate is not much 5447  
 31 of an agreement at all. So, I get six or seven hundred letters 5448  
 32 a year on voluntary quit and if we could put this in, this Bill 5449  
 33 would probably sail. If this one Amendment would go on. But  
 34 barring that, I'm going to be only too happy to take a copy of 5450  
 35 this Roll Call back to my district and the surrounding 5451  
 36 districts and carry it in my pocket and carry it in my hand and 5452

1 wave it and say, 'Look at this'." 5453

2 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, to 5454  
3 explain his vote." 5455

4 Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, because there are a couple of inquiries about 5456  
5 the Amendments in the synopsis. This was, Senate Bill 1331, 5457  
6 was not the agreed Bill to begin with. It was Senator Wooten's 5458  
7 Bill. And he put an Amendment on it himself, number one, to 5460  
8 his liking. Senate Amendments #2 and 3 were from the agreed 5461  
9 Bill process and were slightly incorrect. Then, they put on 4  
10 and 5 to correct it. House Amendment #1 is just a technical 5462  
11 Amendment. And I want to tell you as a supporter of Labor, 5463  
12 that I do not like this agreed Bill process one bit and I'm 5464  
13 going to support it. There's only one thing in it that I 5465  
14 accept. That's, there's only one item of the 13 or 14 that I  
15 accept and I'm going to support the agreed Bill process because 5466  
16 my Chamber of Commerce, my Illinois Association of 5467  
17 Manufacturers asked me to. And my Gov..." 5468

18 Speaker Bradley: "The other Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, to 5469  
19 explain his vote." 5470

20 Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's really refreshing to hear my 5471  
21 colleague on the other side saying he's going to support the 5472  
22 Chamber of Commerce. Very refreshing. Very refreshing. But, 5473  
23 Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you are 5474  
24 really interested in seeing that agreed Bill is passed a fair 5475  
25 change in the Unemployment Compensation Law of the State of 5476  
26 Illinois, you'll vote for this Amendment. It's an important  
27 Amendment to all the citizens of the state and if this piece of 5477  
28 legislation should receive more negative votes than 'aye' 5478  
29 votes, I would ask for a verification of the negative." 5479

30 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins, to explain 5480  
31 his vote." 5481

32 Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, with my district, we have lost over 1500 jobs 5482  
33 since I started running for this office. They just flat picked 5483  
34 up and left on Illinois because of this. Now, we have to try 5484  
35 to do something to help keep these employers in. I think it's 5485  
36 a lot better to try to let someone work than have to draw 5486

1 welfare." 5487

2 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff, to explain 5488  
3 his vote." 5489

4 Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote, I just don't 5490  
5 understand the Legislators here that are voting red against 5491  
6 this Amendment. Any of us that have been around here and heard 5492  
7 from our people know that the person that's being hurt here in 5493  
8 the State of Illinois is the small business people. We're 5494  
9 gradually crowding them out and if we don't put an Amendment  
10 such as this on we're not going to be able to help these people 5495  
11 and, therefore; I just don't understand. I think we're all 5496  
12 interested in the economy of the State of Illinois. We have 5497  
13 the business environment in the State of Illinois is probably 5498  
14 right down to the bottom, the worst of any state. This 5499  
15 Amendment will give this legislation a chance to pass and  
16 instead of hurting the small businessman, we'll help them and 5500  
17 I'd like to certainly pray for more green votes up there." 5502

18 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer, to 5503  
19 explain his vote." 5504

20 Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to point out to my 5505  
21 running mate when he was speaking about the agreed Bill list 5506  
22 that the very concept of an agreed Bill anticipates compromise 5507  
23 of all diverse interest and all parties. Small business was 5508  
24 never represented on that so-called agreed Committee and when 5509  
25 we ask large business and that was on there they explained the 5510  
26 absence of this particular type of provision on the theory that  
27 small businesses would have lay-offs like John Deer does, like 5511  
28 International Harvester does while small business does not have 5512  
29 lay-offs. I would suggest to those of you that represent 5513  
30 unions down here that when you go home you ought to talk to the 5514  
31 people that are members of your labor unions. They're laughing  
32 up your...up their sleeve at you. They can't figure out why 5515  
33 fellow employees can walk off the job voluntarily, get full 5516  
34 payment from the State of Illinois, while they're sitting at 5517  
35 home, while they're going on vacation. You're not representing 5518  
36 the laboring people, you're representing your own self-centered

1 interests with the labor unions and the labor unions rub their 5519  
2 hands together with great glee." 5521

3 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who 5522  
4 wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf, wishes to explain his 5523  
5 vote." 5524

6 Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. People I've talked 5525  
7 to, not the State Chamber, not the manufacturers, not the labor 5526  
8 unions, but the little business people with five, six, eight 5527  
9 employees or individual workers want this changed. They think 5528  
10 it's ridiculous for people to be able to take off, quit their 5529  
11 job, go to India to take care of a sick relative and come back 5530  
12 and collect their unemployment compensation benefits. Now, I  
13 know some of the problems occurred in 1975 when a lot of 5531  
14 liberalized laws were passed by this General Assembly. I 5532  
15 wasn't a Member of that Assembly, but I'd like to point out 5533  
16 that a lot who were and voted for that aren't here today. I 5534  
17 think the people really cry out for a reasonable change. I 5535  
18 don't know what's in the rest of the Amendments, but this one  
19 is certainly reasonable and I'm voting 'aye'." 5537

20 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey, to explain his 5538  
21 vote." 5539

22 Huskey: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, I 5540  
23 hear this word 'agreed Bill'. Actually, I thought the 5541  
24 legislative process was supposed to be done within these walls. 5542  
25 What that word 'agreed Bill' means to me is outside of these 5543  
26 walls. Are we going to let people outside of these walls do 5544  
27 our legislation and then stand up with a piece of paper and say 5545  
28 this is the agreed Bill? How many of you in this House really  
29 agreed to this Bill? I bet there isn't over a half a dozen of 5546  
30 you that agreed to this Bill. You know what you're agreeing 5547  
31 to? You're agreeing to raise the taxes for the employers of 5548  
32 this state. The people that furnish the jobs, the food of this 5549  
33 state and the farmers back in your home district. You're going 5550  
34 to raise their taxes 25% on unemployment compensation. 25%. 5551  
35 That's what this Bill outside of that was designed, outside of  
36 these..." 5552

- 1 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Peoria, 5553  
 2 Mrs. Sumner, to vote...to explain her vote." 5555
- 3 Sumner: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 5556  
 4 Peoria is fast becoming a ghost town. Businesses left and one 5557  
 5 of the reasons is for this extremely high cost of unemployment. 5558  
 6 I'm voting 'yes' on this Amendment to get some relief. Thank 5559  
 7 you." 5560
- 8 Speaker Bradley: "Would Don Eslick please come to the podium please? 5561  
 9 Mr. Schuneman, did you want to explain your vote sir?" 5563
- 10 Schuneman: "Just very briefly, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make a 5564  
 11 plea, one more time, and I would like to point out to my 5565  
 12 colleagues here who it is we're supposed to be representing. 5566  
 13 We're not here to represent big unions. We're not here to 5567  
 14 represent big business. We're supposed to represent all of the 5568  
 15 citizens of the State of Illinois. Now, I think this agreed 5569  
 16 Bill may be agreed to between the very big unions and the very 5570  
 17 big businesses in Illinois. And they can cope with it. But, 5571  
 18 let's represent all the citizens of the State of Illinois. 5572  
 19 Let's reinstate some equity to this system. This is the 5573  
 20 Amendment that would help and go a long, long way toward 5574  
 21 cleaning up our unemployment compensation mess in Illinois. If 5575  
 22 we do not do this, let me suggest to you that a year from now 5576  
 23 when employers ask themselves what has State Government done 5577  
 24 for me lately, the answer will be that we have enacted an 5578  
 25 unemployment comp..." 5579
- 26 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 5580  
 27 The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Matula, to explain his vote." 5581
- 28 Matula: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 5582  
 29 In my opinion, the agreed Bill has a hole in it. There's one 5583  
 30 way to plug up that hole and that is to vote for Amendment 2. 5584  
 31 How are you going to go back and tell your people after many, 5585  
 32 many more companies leave the State of Illinois as they have in 5586  
 33 the last ten years. 1900 businesses have left the State of 5587  
 34 Illinois which is equivalent to 225,000 jobs. Now just think. 5588  
 35 We need this Amendment 2. If we don't have it, the State of 5589  
 36 Illinois is going to be in trouble when many, many more 5590

1 companies leave the state. Thank you." 5589

2 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the 5590

3 record. On this question, there are 81 'ayes' and 91 'nos'. 5591

4 And Mr. Simms asks for verification. Mr. Mulcahey. Mr. 5592

5 Mulcahey would like to be verified as a 'no' vote. That 5593

6 alright? Mr. Dunn. You want to be verified now?" 5594

7 Dunn: "May I have leave to be verified as a 'no' vote?" 5596

8 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Dunn as a...could we verify Mr. Dunn? Okay. 5597

9 Mr. Preston." 5598

10 Preston: "Would you verify me 'no' Mr. Speaker?" 5600

11 Speaker Bradley: "You wish to be verified 'no'. Mr. Preston wishes 5601

12 to be verified no Mr. Simms, is that alright with you? Turn 5602

13 Mr. Simms on." 5603

14 Simms: "That's okay, Mr. Speaker. If we could have the other side of 5604

15 the aisle be in their chairs, it might expedite things so we 5605

16 can..." 5606

17 Speaker Bradley: "Fine. Fine. We'll...Mr. Vitek wishes to be 5607

18 verified." 5608

19 Vitek: "Going to the nurse." 5610

20 Speaker Bradley: "Going to the nurses office. Okay. Alrighty. Mr. 5611

21 Schuneman, do you want a poll of the absentees?" 5613

22 Simms: "We only got four. That probably...Poll the absentees." 5615

23 Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Kozubowski. Pierce. 5616

24 Schlickman and Stearney." 5617

25 Speaker Bradley: "Call the affirmative, or the negative vote." 5619

26 Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Negative Roll Call. Alexander. Balanoff. 5620

27 E. M. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. 5621

28 Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. 5622

29 Christensen. Cullerton. Currie." 5623

30 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Lechowicz wishes to be verified. No leave, 5624

31 fine." 5625

32 Clerk Leone: "Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. 5626

33 John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. 5627

34 Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. 5628

35 Huff. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly. 5629

36 Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kucharski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. 5630

1 Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. 5  
2 McClain. McPike. Molloy. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. 5  
3 O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Polk. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. 5  
4 Richmond. Ronan. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. 5  
5 Schraeder. Sharp. Slape. Steczko. Stuffle. Taylor. 5  
6 Terzich. Van Duyne. Vitek. VonBoeckman. White. Willer. 5  
7 Williams. Sam Wolf. Young. Yourell. and Mr. Speaker." 5  
8 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Bell, what purpose do you rise? You wish to go 5  
9 from an 'aye' to 'no'. Record Mr. Bell as 'no'. Jane Barnes 5  
10 wishes to go from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. Schoeberlein, what 5  
11 purpose do you rise sir?" 5  
12 Schoeberlein: "I had my light lit when we were debating the Amendment 5  
13 to the Bill, but I was not recognized." 5  
14 Speaker Bradley: "I'm sorry sir. I apologize to you. I didn't see 5  
15 your light. I thought we called on every person that their 5  
16 light was flashing." 5  
17 Schoeberlein: "My quest..." 5  
18 Speaker Bradley: "Pardon Mr. Schoeberlein." 5  
19 Schoeberlein: "I'll say what I wanted to on the next Amendment and 5  
20 put in what I wanted to say on the other one." 5  
21 Speaker Bradley: "Alright. You'll be the first one recognized. 5  
22 Question of the negative vote." 5  
23 Simms: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative Beatty." 5  
24 Speaker Bradley: "Beatty is in the balcony." 5  
25 Simms: "Representative Breslin." 5  
26 Speaker Bradley: "Representative who?" 5  
27 Simms: "Breslin." 5  
28 Speaker Bradley: "She's in her chair." 5  
29 Simms: "Okay. Representative Ewell." 5  
30 Speaker Bradley: "Ewell. Was here just a second ago. Representative 5  
31 Ewell. How is the Gentleman recorded?" 5  
32 Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'." 5  
33 Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll." 5  
34 Simms: "Representative...Representative Dawson." 5  
35 Speaker Bradley: "Representative Dawson. Gentleman in the chamber?" 5  
36 Simms: "I see him." 5

1	Speaker Bradley: "Here he is over here."	5685
2	Simms: "Representative Domico."	5687
3	Speaker Bradley: "Domico. Is Domico here? How is he recorded?"	5689
4	Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."	5691
5	Speaker Bradley: "And Mr. Garmisa asks to have leave to be verified.	5692
6	Fine. Alright. Mr. Domico is back...put him back on the Roll	5693
7	as a 'no' vote."	5694
8	Simms: "Representative Emil Jones."	5696
9	Speaker Bradley: "Emil Jones. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How	5697
10	is he recorded?"	5698
11	Clerk Leone: " Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."	5700
12	Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."	5702
13	Simms: "Representative Keane."	5704
14	Speaker Bradley: "He's in the back. He's in his seat."	5706
15	Simms: "Representative Laurino."	5708
16	Speaker Bradley: "Laurino. He's not in his seat. How is he	5709
17	recorded? Here he is right here in the, walked in the door."	5710
18	Simms: "Okay."	5713
19	Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Madigan wishes to be verified."	5715
20	Simms: "Okay. Representative Kelly."	5717
21	Speaker Bradley: "Representative Kelly. His coat's there. Is he in	5718
22	the chambers? How is he recorded?"	5720
23	Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."	5722
24	Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll Call. There he is. Put him	5723
25	back on."	5724
26	Simms: "Okay. Representative Leverenz."	5726
27	Speaker Bradley: "Leverenz is in his seat."	5728
28	Simms: "Representative Schneider."	5730
29	Speaker Bradley: "Schneider. Representative Schneider is not in his	5731
30	seat. Here he is in the door way."	5733
31	Simms: "Representative Terzich."	5735
32	Speaker Bradley: "Terzich. Representative Terzich. How is he	5736
33	recorded?"	5737
34	Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."	5739
35	Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."	5741
36	Simms: "Representative Willer."	5743



1 Speaker Bradley: "Willer. She is in her chair." 5745

2 Simms: "Steczo." 5747

3 Speaker Bradley: "Steczo is in his chair." 5749

4 Simms: "Representative Stuffle." 5751

5 Speaker Bradley: "He's right by his seat here." 5753

6 Simms: "Representative Flinn." 5755

7 Speaker Bradley: "He was verified." 5757

8 Simms: "I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Representative Bullock." 5758

9 Speaker Bradley: "Representative Bullock's in his chair." 5761

10 Simms: "Taylor. I can't see over..." 5763

11 Speaker Bradley: "...yeah...Senator...Taylor and Bullock are both 5764

12 here. The Gentleman in the center aisle, would you..." 5766

13 Simms: "I'm sorry Mr...I couldn't see." 5768

14 Speaker Bradley: "They can't see through over there. That better?" 5769

15 Simms: "Yeah. That's fine. I only have a couple more. 5771

16 Representative Ronan." 5772

17 Speaker Bradley: "Ronan is in his seat." 5774

18 Simms: "Okay. And last, but not least, Representative Farley. Okay 5775

19 Bruce. I have no more..." 5777

20 Speaker Bradley: "Okay. Fine. Thank you. What's the count? This 5778

21 question there are 79 'ayes' and 90 'nos' and the, 90 'nos' and 5779

22 the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments." 5781

23 Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Deuster. Amends Senate Bill 1331 on page 5782

24 12 by inserting..." 5784

25 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster." 5786

26 Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The 5787

27 average business person that we come in contact, when we 5788

28 campaign for re-election, walking up and down the main street 5789

29 of our towns, the drug stores, the cleaners, or somewhere else, 5790

30 is the person is a little upset over paying Unemployment 5791

31 Compensation Taxes, but everybody is upset about paying taxes, 5792

32 but what really aggravates them and makes them angry, and 5792

33 that's why this subject is before us today, that's why we have 5793

34 had summit conferences on this, is that they're really mad 5794

35 about the unfairness and the inequity where they have some lazy 5795

36 loafer who just takes off because he gets tired of working, and 5796

1 that they have to pay for that. Now, this Amendment #3 that is 5796  
2 before us, defines, in a very narrow and specific way, for 5797  
3 special cases that are not to be considered good cause for 5798  
4 leaving, or good cause for getting benefits. Now the problem 5799  
5 with this whole system is that you and I and all of us in the 5800  
6 Legislature, get blamed by the people for the law, but the  
7 reason that the law is poorly administered is because the 5801  
8 bureaucrats who make bad judgments over what is good cause, 5802  
9 rather than those of us who are well intentioned. I have a 5803  
10 letter in my hand that I think all of you got, about this 5804  
11 fellow Tyrone White. He's the one who got tired of traveling  
12 five miles to his work and he gave the excuse for leaving his 5805  
13 job that the cost of gasoline had gone up, and lo and behold if 5806  
14 they didn't find that he was eligible for unemployment 5807  
15 compensation benefits. That's shocking, that's wrong. I think 5808  
16 we all agree. Now, what this Amendment does before you, 5809  
17 Amendment #3. It says good cause shall not include four  
18 things. Leaving work for the convenience of the employee. 5810  
19 That's 'cause you just got sick and tired of working and you 5811  
20 felt like quitting. Number two, quitting to accept another job 5812  
21 to accept other employment. Number three is quitting to either 5813  
22 join your spouse, your husband or wife, who..or your mother or 5814  
23 somebody else. If you quit a job to go live with your aunt in 5815  
24 Florida, that should not be good cause. And the fourth reason 5816  
25 is to leave the state. It seems to me that if we narrow down  
26 some instances that we all can agree on that shouldn't be good 5817  
27 cause, the person who leaves to go to Florida, the person who 5818  
28 leaves to follow his or her spouse somewhere else, the person 5819  
29 who leaves just for their own personal convenience, are not the 5820  
30 kind of people that really should qualify for this system. 5821  
31 Unemployment Compensation is supposed to give you some benefits  
32 to tide you over when unexpectedly, you lose your job. Not 5822  
33 because...not when you quit just 'cause you're tired of the job 5823  
34 that you have. I think this is a good Amendment. I don't 5824  
35 think it's as broad as the prior admendment we considered. I 5825  
36 think it will improve the Bill and I think it will help mollify 5826

1 the anger that has made our people so mad at all of us, 5826  
 2 irrespective of whether we're Democrats or Republicans. They 5827  
 3 blame us all for this bad law and the way that it is being 5828  
 4 poorly administered. I would be happy to answer any questions. 5829  
 5 I would urge your favorable vote for this Amendment, which is 5830  
 6 narrowly drawn, and which exempts out some instances that just  
 7 should not be considered to be good cause for quitting a job 5831  
 8 and getting the unemployment benefits." 5833

9 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Schoeberlein." 5835

10 Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 5836

11 This isn't really the Amendment I wanted to speak on, but I'll 5837  
 12 touch on it after I finish the other one. I was here when the 5838  
 13 Senate Bill 234 and 235 were passed. I predicted what was 5839  
 14 going to happen. The first casualty was Senator McCarthy, who 5840  
 15 was the Sponsor of the Bill in the Senate, and he carried that 5841  
 16 stigma with him wherever he goes. Now, this...I formerly was  
 17 surrounded by Democrats. At three years...all these were 5842  
 18 Democrats at the time. Look where they are now. They're all 5843  
 19 gone and I'm predicting again that we're going to be over in 5844  
 20 there. Mark my words. I'm...I'm going to use what is 5845  
 21 happening here today for my campaign and I'll announce right  
 22 now, in case some of you think that this party they had for me 5846  
 23 the other night was a farewell party. I'll run again and I'll 5847  
 24 use this fight today that we are not helping the manufacturer 5848  
 25 and others. We...none of us are certain of being re-elected. 5849  
 26 My counter-part on the Democratic side is not certain of being 5850  
 27 elected...re-elected. My counter-part on the Republican side,  
 28 but I can assure you that we will use this and there are other 5851  
 29 things. The people back home are writing in for Roll Calls 5852  
 30 now, and they call me. And, I tell them what they are. I get 5853  
 31 them for them and they don't like what they see. I was 5854  
 32 planning on getting out of here, but with the way things are 5855  
 33 going, industry in Aurora has left. Representative on the 5856  
 34 other side, his factory has left and gone back to Ohio. So, 5857  
 35 there's unemployment there and so has several others have gone 5858  
 36 and left Illinois and Aurora. I don't like to see it, 'cause

1 my dad was with the Burlington Railroad fifty years and he was 5859  
 2 a union man. And he retired from the Burlington. He always 5860  
 3 told me, 'don't ever go work for a railroad' and I didn't. 5861  
 4 But, I had been with the same firm 46 years when I retired. I 5862  
 5 beg your pardon. Were you wanting a reply to your crack? So, 5863  
 6 I did want to say these things that this was formerly all  
 7 Democrats right here. And I'll predict what's going to happen. 5864  
 8 We're going to have 5 more over in there. I..it's been that 5865  
 9 way before. And so, watch what we're doing. We're not hurting 5866  
 10 the labor with this Amendment. They demand...in fact, they 5867  
 11 don't like it, when a man will leave a \$6 and \$8 an hour job 5868  
 12 and get's lazy and goes out and walks out of the plant and goes  
 13 down and gets unemployment. They don't like that. I mix with 5869  
 14 the man in the factory. I will when I get back more so than I 5870  
 15 have. So, remember what you're doing. Mr. McCarthy found out 5872  
 16 what happened and so will others. So, remember you're also  
 17 dealing with two kinds of people. You're dealing with the man 5873  
 18 that brings you the bread and you're dealing with a man that 5874  
 19 wants the bread. So, let's vote according to your conscience. 5875  
 20 We're not hurting anybody with the Bill we just...the Amendment 5876  
 21 we just lost." 5877

22 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike." 5879

23 McPike: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this 5880  
 24 Amendment. I would like to comment on the individual parts of 5881  
 25 it. It says that the good cause shall not include leaving work 5882  
 26 for the convenience of the employee. There is no...we actually 5883  
 27 have no idea what is meant by convenience of the employee under 5884  
 28 this language. There is no case...court cases to a...for 5885  
 29 guidelines. Under current law, for example, if you quit  
 30 because you don't like your boss or you quit because you're 5886  
 31 just tired of working there. Under current language of the 5887  
 32 law, you would not be eligible for unemployment insurance and 5888  
 33 this change, perhaps may make a...may make a difference. We 5889  
 34 can't tell by the language. The second point addressed. It  
 35 says that good cause shall not include leaving work to accept 5890  
 36 other employment. Well, if you leave work to accept other 5891

1 employment, you're not eligible for unemployment insurance 5892  
 2 today, because, indeed, you're working. The third part that is 5893  
 3 mentioned here and that is to join or remain with a spouse. I 5894  
 4 think everyone on the House floor knows that the...that a we 5895  
 5 have a very mobile work force today and by and large, it's 5896  
 6 usually the male member of the family that's asked to move and 5897  
 7 it's the female member of the family under...in today's society 5898  
 8 that is required to follow her spouse to another state. This 5899  
 9 is really a sexist Amendment, which would discriminate against 5900  
 10 women. There's no way of getting around it. It simply would 5901  
 11 discriminate against all women in the work force. And finally, 5902  
 12 the last provision of this, and I think you should be aware of 5903  
 13 this, where it says they are prohibited from leaving the state, 5904  
 14 the federal government requires that your unemployment 5905  
 15 insurance be flexible enough to make payments to people in 5906  
 16 other states, another state. For example, we could pick the 5907  
 17 state of Wisconsin. A number of people live there...leave 5908  
 18 there to come to Illinois to work. We are number five on their 5909  
 19 list and of..the most..in a State where the most people that 5910  
 20 leave there, go to work, we're number eleventh on the 5911  
 21 California list. So, in order to restrict it like this, we 5912  
 22 would be out of compliance with federal law and would probably 5913  
 23 cost the State roughly \$800,000,000, because we would not be in 5914  
 24 compliance. So, for all those reasons, I think we should vote 5915  
 25 against this." 5916

26 Speaker Bradley: "We have an announcement. Those members of the 5917  
 27 House that went home this weekend must sign a certificate in 5918  
 28 the Speaker's Office, if you want to get your mileage allowance 5919  
 29 to go to and from home for the weekend. So, those of you who 5920  
 30 haven't done it, I suggest you do it right now, because she's 5921  
 31 going to send the certification on to the Comptroller's Office 5922  
 32 for payment immediately. So, you'd better scoot in to the  
 33 Speaker's Office. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers." 5923

34 Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, you Democrats, you better listen to me now. 5924  
 35 McCarthy, Senator McCarty is from my district. For years, he 5925  
 36 was easily elected with landslides because all of my three 5926

1 counties are Democratic. He lost by a landslide on this 5923  
 2 proposition. A landslide. He even lost Christian County, 5924  
 3 which never went Republican before. He lost it. And I'm  
 4 telling you here and now, I hope you are fool enough to go 5925  
 5 against this Bill." 5926

6 Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Sangamon, 5927  
 7 Mr. Kane, arise?" 5928

8 Kane: "Would ask the Member to confine himself to the contents of the 5929  
 9 Amendment please?" 5931

10 Borchers: "That's exactly what I'm doing. I'm telling you what will 5932  
 11 happen to you if you don't go along." 5934

12 Kane: "No, that's not the Amendment, sir." 5936

13 Borchers: "I think this is...I oppose to this Amendment because it's 5937  
 14 the very kind of a Bill." 5939

15 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman...the Gentleman from..." 5941

16 Borchers: "Wait a minute. I'm not through yet. I haven't..." 5943

17 Speaker Bradley: "You're going to be ruled out of order, unless you 5944  
 18 talk to the Amendment." 5946

19 Borchers: "Well I will then speak, I am speaking to the Amendment. 5947  
 20 I'll speak a little more furtherly...a little further on this 5948  
 21 Amendment. I just want to point out again and repeat to you 5949  
 22 what I've told you before. I go to Florida nearly every winter 5950  
 23 and I see the men down there laying on the beach ogling the 5951  
 24 girls at our expense and I resent it. Therefore..." 5952

25 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan." 5954

26 Hanahan: "Speaker and Members of the House. It's odd that the 5955  
 27 Gentleman that sponsored this Amendment, who happens to have a 5956  
 28 district that includes a border district with another state, 5957  
 29 would somehow try to prevent some of his constituents who want 5958  
 30 to get a different job in the state of Wisconsin, which means 5959  
 31 to walk across the street to the Charm-Glo Products, for 5960  
 32 example, in the State of Wisconsin, which is right outside of 5961  
 33 Manitowac, and I'm sure the Gentleman is well aware of. If 5962  
 34 their employment in the city of Manitowac in the State of 5963  
 35 Illinois side would be no longer available, that somehow, this 5964  
 36 Amendment, which I can't make heads or tails out, as a legal 5964

1 document and he being a lawyer should really realize what he's 5965  
2 doing to some of his constituents. But, going even further 5966  
3 than that on this Amendment, you're talking about rights of 5967  
4 individuals being treated somehow as a unit instead of as an  
5 individual. I've never heard of an employer trying to pay an 5968  
6 employee a different rate just because he or she happens to be 5969  
7 married. Why should there then be any difference in the 5970  
8 economic disaster that takes place because the person happens 5971  
9 to be married and wants to follow a spouse to another place of  
10 employment? I think there are other reasons why this Amendment 5972  
11 is bad, but I would like to reiterate once again. That going 5973  
12 back to the agreed process...I'm sure that the conferees of the 5974  
13 agreement took into consideration this proposed Amendment and 5975  
14 that this Amendment was discussed by those conferees when they 5976  
15 were deliberating on what changes would take place in the  
16 Unemployment Compensation Act. And I'm sure they evaluated on 5977  
17 an actuarially sound position that this Amendment wouldn't make 5978  
18 one hill of beans difference in the actual cost of unemployment 5979  
19 compensation in Illinois. In fact, I'd go further than that 5980  
20 and say that most of these proposed Amendments that are coming  
21 on our desks and are filed on this Bill would not reduce the 5981  
22 rates. And, this is why the Chamber of Commerce, in a very 5982  
23 reasonable posture, has said that they are in support of Senate 5983  
24 Bill 1331 with no other Amendments. The fact remains that you 5984  
25 could adopt all those Amendments and it won't reduce the  
26 unemployment compensation tax one penny. Now lets be very 5985  
27 factual that that is what some businessmen and some 5986  
28 manufacturers are concerned about. It's the tax that's placed 5987  
29 upon them, not the manner and the mechanism of the Unemployment  
30 Compensation Act. So, you can beat your gums all you want 5988  
31 about how good some of these Amendments are, including this 5989  
32 one, which may have some validity in trying to prevent some 5990  
33 actions that are not palatable to most of us. But the fact 5991  
34 remains that it's not going to change the tax and that's where  
35 the issue really lies. Now, I heard a lot of threats here 5992  
36 also. I might point out, I was the House Sponsor of Senate 5993

1 Bill 285 and I could remind the Gentleman, I ran for 5994  
 2 re-election without opposition after it, so I don't think it's 5995  
 3 necessarily true that because you vote 'no' on these kinds of  
 4 Amendments that any House Member has to fear for his political 5996  
 5 future. I might point out further that the agreed Bill process 5997  
 6 fell down when the Republicans controlled the House and Senate 5998  
 7 and the Governorship and did not follow through on an agreement 5999  
 8 in 1971. And, what took place after that, a further decline in 6000  
 9 a reasonable settlement on changes in unemployment compensation 6001  
 10 took place. And here we are today trying to put back the egg  
 11 that cracked when it fell in '71 into some sort of reasonable 6003  
 12 posture that reasonable people will take actuarially sound 6004  
 13 figures, put it together and reasonably come out with a Bill 6005  
 14 that we could all live with and go back home and know that our  
 15 constituency, whether it be the business or the working man and 6006  
 16 woman clientele, that those people are comfortable with the 6007  
 17 laws of Illinois concerning unemployment insurance. I suggest 6008  
 18 that this is a bad Amendment. It certainly would be terrible 6009  
 19 in the areas of border counties that where the employment  
 20 picture slips back and forth into adjoining counties that 6010  
 21 wouldn't even be definable in these areas as far as the manner 6011  
 22 in which a spouse going to and from another state for 6012  
 23 employment would be able to be eligible for unemployment 6013  
 24 insurance. For this reason, and many others, I find this a bad  
 25 Amendment and should receive a resounding 'no'." 6015

26 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen." 6017

27 Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question." 6019

28 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in 6020  
 29 favor of the Gentleman's motion, say 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 6021  
 30 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Mr. 6022  
 31 Deuster to close the debate." 6023

32 Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Many of 6024  
 33 you know that I enjoy music and one of my favorite 6025  
 34 country-western songs some of you have heard is the one about 6026  
 35 the disgruntled employee who...the title of it..You Can Take 6027  
 36 This Job and Shove It. Now, none of us like to work and a lot 6028



1 of people don't like jobs and they'd like to take it and they'd  
2 like to shove it and they would like to just walk off because  
3 they're sick of working. That's all. Now, if you think that  
4 the people back home are going to be happy if you vote against  
5 an Amendment that says that somebody says take this job and  
6 shove it, that he ought to qualify for unemployment benefits,  
7 then you vote 'no'. But, what this Amendment does is, it says  
8 that the employees just for his own convenience because he is  
9 sick and tired of working walks off he should not or she should  
10 not be entitled to benefits. Now I'm really flattered and  
11 complimented by Representative Hanahan's remarks because he's  
12 quite an expert on this subject, but he had to dodge the issue  
13 and go on to taxes, which has got nothing to do with it. We  
14 know the tax rate is going up, but this Amendment deals with  
15 the qualifications, not taxes. There are good ideas in here.  
16 I think that most people would agree that the unemployment  
17 compensation system is not to be..thinking of another  
18 song..Easy Street, you're not going to just sit back and draw  
19 money from the government forever if you get tired of working.  
20 It's not supposed to be a welfare system. The system is  
21 supposed to help out somebody who loses a job by surprise, not  
22 through his own fault, but by surprise. And I say that this  
23 Amendment that says when you leave for your own convenience,  
24 that's no surprise. I think it's a good Amendment. It's  
25 carefully drawn and I would urge your favorable vote for it."

26 Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment.  
27 All in favor of the Gentleman's motion, signify by voting  
28 'aye', those oppose by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish?  
29 The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff, to explain his vote."

30 Huff: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker, ah, my 'present' vote represents  
31 my position perfectly in this debate. I remember as a freshman  
32 coming down here in 1975, that that was legislation that was  
33 passed affecting our general labor picture and particularly  
34 that of unemployment insurance and ever since that legislation  
35 went out everything has fallen apart. It's quite clear that  
36 the only way that we are going to resolve this situation is not

1 on a partisan issue, but on a bi-partisan issue. I'm sitting 6061  
 2 here laughing because last...two years ago we introduced some 6062  
 3 of this legislation that was killed in the Department of Labor 6063  
 4 and now I see it cut up on two sides of the aisle. The only 6064  
 5 way you are going to resolve this problem is that you are going 6065  
 6 to have to come together because we do have a problem with our 6066  
 7 economic picture." 6067

8 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 6068  
 9 Record. On this question, there are 74 'ayes' and 94 'nays'. 6069  
 10 This Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments." 6071

11 Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Deuster. Amends Senate Bill 1331 on 6072  
 12 page 12 by inserting between line 14 and the un-numbered line, 6073  
 13 the following and so forth." 6074

14 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Friedland. For what 6075  
 15 purpose do you rise?" 6077

16 Friedland: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 6078  
 17 Regarding your recent announcement that those Members who went 6079  
 18 home this past week, while we were in continuance session are 6080  
 19 supposed to get reimbursed, I think that's the heighth of folly 6081  
 20 and ridiculous and you had better check it out. Of course, you 6082  
 21 might as well be shouting down the sewer." 6083

22 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, on Amendment 6084  
 23 #4." 6085

24 Deuster: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In presenting Amendment 6086  
 25 #4, I would like to suggest to all of you, what I'm sure you 6087  
 26 know is obvious. This Bill, in its present form, is not the 6088  
 27 Ten Commandments. It's not sacred. It's not something that we 6089  
 28 can't consider Amendments to. I would say with respect to 6090  
 29 Amendment #4, Amendment #4 says that where an employee walks 6091  
 30 off the job or quits, that he cannot qualify for unemployment 6092  
 31 benefits under the grounds of good cause, unless at least two 6093  
 32 weeks, within a two week period after he takes off he 6094  
 33 communicates to his employer what the reason was that he left. 6094  
 34 You know one reason that so many people are angry...the small 6095  
 35 employers around this state from one end to the other of this 6095  
 36 state...the reason they are so unhappy and angry is because 6096

1 they are running a business and all of a sudden one day 6  
2 somebody just doesn't show up and they don't even have the 6  
3 decency to call them on the phone or write them a letter or 6  
4 anything. Some employers wonder if they didn't get killed or 6  
5 run over by a truck. And all of sudden, after never hearing 6  
6 from them again, they find out that they go over to some 6  
7 unemployment office and they contrive a reason for why they 6  
8 quit and they qualify themselves for benefits. I think a, just 6  
9 a matter of decency and human relations between one person and 6  
10 another that an employee ought to communicate to the employer 6  
11 why he quit, why he left. If she's following her husband to 6  
12 Florida or California, well let her communicate that. This 6  
13 Amendment doesn't discriminate against anybody. But it just 6  
14 does, it is designed to prevent fabrication or dreaming up 6  
15 phoney, wild reasons for why you quit after you've gone into 6  
16 the employment office and somebody there tells you well you'd 6  
17 better have a good reason, so I'll help you out, contrive one 6  
18 now. This says that when you quit and take off for fourteen 6  
19 days, in that period, you've got to notify your employer or 6  
20 communicate. It can be by telephone or letter, any way you 6  
21 want to communicate, why you left. Then the...that's only fair 6  
22 and I would be happy to answer any questions and ask your 6  
23 support for the Amendment." 6

24 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi." 6

25 Giorgi: "Well Mr. Speaker, I think, I think the Gentleman that 6  
26 offered this Amendment owes us an apology. He's indicating 6  
27 that since Governor Thompson became Governor and as 6  
28 administrator of the Unemployment Act, that he's hiring idiots 6  
29 to run his employment services. Now, if you've had anyone in 6  
30 your office, except on a fee basis, and a person came in your 6  
31 office and asked for help with his unemployment problem, you'll 6  
32 find that they are denying 90% of these type cases and they are 6  
33 asking to prove why they quit. They are making them sign up 6  
34 with the employment services. They're sending them before 6  
35 hearing officers. They're sending them before referees. Now, 6  
36 you're implying here that the Governor is hiring nothing but 6

1 bubble idiots that are granting unemployment compensation to  
2 every turn of the road. Well, I think it's an insult to our  
3 intelligence for you to come in here with an Amendment that you  
4 know is being taken care of by the Administration. Now, let me  
5 tell you what else is happening out there. The Administration  
6 is tightening up on the unemployment process and these people  
7 you're talking about aren't getting unemployment compensation  
8 and if they are getting it, it's the fault of the  
9 Administration. So, I think you ought to apologize for  
10 your...for this insipid Amendment."

11 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

12 Simms: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate my colleague from  
13 Winnebago telling us Republicans why we're not getting any  
14 patronage jobs, he's hiring former Democrats."

15 Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment.  
16 All in favor of the Gentleman's motion, signify by voting  
17 'aye', oppose by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The  
18 Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 62  
19 'ayes', 92 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further  
20 Amendments."

21 Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5. Deuster. Amends Senate Bill 1331  
22 on page 12."

23 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Deuster, the Gentleman from..."

24 Deuster: "Amendment #5 is very similar to one that was rejected  
25 rather substantially and with that in mind, I will withdraw  
26 Amendment #5."

27 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman withdraws Amendment #5. Further  
28 Amendments."

29 Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6. Ryan. Amends Senate Bill 1331 on page  
30 11 in line 32 and so forth."

31 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Kankakee. Mr. Ryan on Amendment #6.  
32 He withdraws it. Further Amendments."

33 Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #7. Deuster. Amends Senate Bill 1331."

34 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Deuster on Amendment #7."

35 Deuster: "Yes, this is for real. This is an educational Amendment, I  
36 think for some members. We're all wondering why business is

1 going to other states. In other states, in fact in 36 states 6171  
 2 and all of the states that surround us, if you leave a job 6172  
 3 without good cause, you're disqualified forever. For the 6173  
 4 duration. We...we disqualify you just for some weeks.  
 5 Amendment #7 would conform Illinois to the law as it is in 36 6174  
 6 other states including Wisconsin to the North. We adopt this 6175  
 7 Amendment we'll have the same laws as in Wisconsin, Indiana to 6176  
 8 the East, Missouri, Kentucky, Iowa, Michigan, all the 6177  
 9 surrounding states, 36 states. And this is, that if you leave  
 10 without good cause, you should not be entitled to unemployment 6178  
 11 benefits..." 6179

12 Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, sir. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van 6180  
 13 Duynes. For what purpose do you rise?" 6182

14 Van Duynes: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Parliamentary inquiry. Isn't the 6183  
 15 Gentleman being repetitive and wouldn't you class that as being 6184  
 16 dilatory?" 6185

17 Speaker Bradley: "Are you through representing the..." 6187

18 Van Duynes: "The Amendments are all the same, Mr. Speaker." 6189

19 Speaker Bradley: " We'll take a look at...Are you through 6190  
 20 representing the Amendment, sir? Mr. Deuster." 6192

21 Deuster: "Well, I think LeRoy must have been sleeping or off the 6193  
 22 floor. This is not the same at all. I withdrew one that was 6194  
 23 the same. This is entirely different." 6196

24 Speaker Bradley: "Are you through presenting the Bill, the 6197  
 25 Amendment?" 6198

26 Deuster: "I think he's on the wrong number. Ryan withdrew one that's 6199  
 27 the same, LeRoy." 6200

28 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, on the 6201  
 29 Amendment." 6202

30 McPike: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Actually, the agreed Bill is much 6203  
 31 more strict on those people who quit work than this Amendment 6204  
 32 does. This would allow you to quit...ah, quit your job and go 6205  
 33 to work for three days and get laid off and then collect 6206  
 34 unemployment insurance. What we tried to do was tighten up 6207  
 35 that loop hole and the original Bill 1331 does just that. It 6208  
 36 says that if you voluntarily quit, you have to earn six times

1 your weekly benefit amount before you'll ever be eligible for 6209  
2 unemployment insurance again. Now, this Amendment here goes 6210  
3 back to the old situation where you can quit, go to work for 6211  
4 three days and get laid off and then collect it. Now, if 6212  
5 that's really what we want to do, go back and include that loop  
6 hole in the law, fine then you should vote for that. If we 6213  
7 want to tighten the law as 1331 does and make it more 6214  
8 difficult, then you should vote against this Amendment." 6216

9 Speaker Bradley: "Question's on the adoption of this Amendment. All 6217  
10 in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', 6218  
11 oppose by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all 6219  
12 voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this 6220  
13 question, there are 60 'ayes', 99 'nos' and the Gentleman's 6221  
14 motion fails. Further Amendments." 6222

15 Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8." 6224

16 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe." 6226

17 Clerk O'Brien: "Amends Senate Bill 1331 on Page 7 and so forth." 6228

18 Speaker Bradley: "McAuliffe withdraws. Further Amendments." 6230

19 Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #9. Huskey. Amends Senate Bill 1331 as 6231  
20 amended in Section 1 of the Bill..." 6233

21 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey." 6235

22 Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 6236  
23 Amendment #9 is a very simple Amendment. So much of our money 6237  
24 that is paid on unemployment is taken out of our state, spent 6238  
25 in other states, which further reduces unemployment in the 6239  
26 state because the money is no longer here to regenerate itself. 6240  
27 Senate Amendment #9 is only a very simple Amendment that  
28 requires that the unemployed report back to the employment 6241  
29 station every two weeks, once every two weeks to say here I am, 6242  
30 I'm available for work, where is a job and I want to go back to 6243  
31 work. In most cases, this is to bring them back from the 6244  
32 sunbelt states, from Florida, California, Arizona, where if you 6245  
33 check the statistics where the checks are being mailed, you  
34 will find that most of them are all mailed to these sunbelt 6247  
35 states, and most probably the highest number is during the  
36 month of December. So, what are we doing? We're building up 6248

1 the states that are taking our factories and they're also 6249  
 2 taking our unemployed people who we're paying high benefits to 6250  
 3 every week, so it's a very simple Amendment and I move for its 6251  
 4 favorable adoption." 6252

5 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike." 6254

6 McPike: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I 6255  
 7 oppose this Amendment and I think most other people that 6256  
 8 listened to an explanation probably would also. The 6257  
 9 Department...the Bureau of Employment Security currently has 6258  
 10 the power to implement this by regulation if they so desire. 6259  
 11 The fact is that by having people come in every week, each and 6260  
 12 every week, creates an administrative nightmare and so, the 6261  
 13 Governor, the current Governor, the previous Governor simply 6262  
 14 have rejected that. They have gone to a system now that is 6263  
 15 working very well. As I said previously, about 30% of those 6264  
 16 people applying are now being denied. They have a program in 6265  
 17 operation where approximately 5% of those receiving benefits 6266  
 18 are called in at various times to check up and they plan on 6267  
 19 expanding that. But, to have every single person come in would 6268  
 20 simply be impossible. It would increase the cost of the system 6269  
 21 and it would put us back where we were in the administration in 6270  
 22 1976." 6271

23 Speaker Bradley: "Question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All 6270  
 24 in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', 6271  
 25 oppose say 'no'. The 'nos' have it. The motion fails. 6272  
 26 Further Amendments." 6273

27 Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #10. Huskey. Amends Senate Bill 1331 on 6274  
 28 page 1 in line 6..." 6276

29 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey." 6278

30 Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a Roll Call on that last 6279  
 31 Amendment because I want to use these Roll Calls to take back 6280  
 32 to my district in the next election and I think you gave Roll 6281  
 33 Call to the other members of the House. I feel I'm entitled to 6282  
 34 a verified...certi...a Roll Call." 6283

35 Speaker Bradley: "You're on Amendment #10. Mr. Huskey on #10." 6285

36 Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I asked for a Roll Call on #9, which I 6286

1 didn't get and I feel I represent as many people as you do sir 6287  
 2 and I think I'm entitled to it." 6288

3 Speaker Bradley: "We'll get a Roll Call on #10 for you." 6290

4 Huskey: "That isn't the Amendment...#10 is a different Amendment, Mr. 6291  
 5 Speaker. I'm asking you and in all fairness, I feel that 6292  
 6 you're a fair man and I feel I should have a Roll Call on 6293  
 7 Amendment #9." 6294

8 Speaker Bradley: "They're many occasions when we adopt or don't adopt 6295  
 9 Amendments on a voice vote." 6297

10 Huskey: "You gave me a fast gavel. I didn't even get a chance to 6298  
 11 explain...to close my...to close on Amendment #9. You gave me 6299  
 12 the fast gavel, you didn't give me a chance to close and I was 6300  
 13 treated very unfairly." 6301

14 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi. For what 6302  
 15 purpose do you rise?" 6304

16 Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker. To expedite matters, let him proceed with this 6305  
 17 Amendment and this Roll Call can suffice for both Amendments. 6306  
 18 How's that." 6307

19 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman asked for a Roll Call on Number 9. 6308  
 20 Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich on point of order." 6310

21 Matijevich: "Well I make the point of order Mr. Speaker. You did go 6311  
 22 to the next Amendment and for him to say, at least he's man 6312  
 23 enough to say he's...he wants it for his silly political 6313  
 24 purposes. That's more than a lot would admit, I guess. But, 6314  
 25 he is out of order because we did go on to the next Amendment. 6315  
 26 And I don't care what anyone wants to use it for, he stood 6316  
 27 there silently and didn't call for it. Now, he woke up late 6317  
 28 and realized that he wants to use it against Buzz Yourell. 6317  
 29 Well, well there's a lot of Roll Calls that Buzz Yourell could 6318  
 30 use against him too." 6319

31 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Kankakee. Minority Leader, Mr. 6320  
 32 Ryan." 6321

33 Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker you certainly know the man is entitled to 6322  
 34 the Roll Call. Why don't you eliminate all this nonsense. You 6323  
 35 beat every Amendment you wanted to defeat on these Bills. Go 6324  
 36 back to 9. Give him his Roll Call. Let's move on to the order 6325



1 of business." 6326

2 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Giorgi moves to reconsider the vote by which 6327

3 the Amendment #9 failed. We'll take a vote on the Gentleman's 6328

4 motion. On the motion, Mr. Yourell." 6330

5 Yourell: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. The South County Commerce has 6331

6 probably got a copy on the last two or three Roll Calls 6332

7 already. I don't mind my good friend and colleague from the 6333

8 8th District asking for Roll Calls. I know what he is going to 6334

9 use them for, but he'll still run third. Give him a Roll 6335

10 Call." 6336

11 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hanahan on the motion." 6338

12 Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the Gentleman has four 6339

13 Amendments and if you'd agree, I wouldn't mind having one Roll 6340

14 Call on Amendments #9, 10, 11, 12. They're all going to get 6341

15 the same treatment. Why don't he accept one Roll Call. It 6342

16 will save the Clerk a lot of time, it will save the House a lot 6343

17 of time. Give him leave to speak on the four Amendments. Give 6344

18 him one Roll Call and he can publish it in his papers all he 6345

19 wants." 6346

20 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Huskey, do you wish to take them all at one 6347

21 time? Alright. We're on Mr. Giorgi's Amendment to reconsider. 6348

22 All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', oppose 'no'. 6349

23 The 'ayes' have it. We're reconsidered. We're back to 6350

24 Amendment #9. The motion...all in favor of the Gentleman's 6351

25 motion..Mr. Huskey, do you wish to close?" 6352

26 Huskey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I do wish to close. The fancy tooth 6353

27 sayers that I hear on the other side opposing this Amendment 6354

28 may remind me of Nero playing his fiddle while Rome burned." 6356

29 Speaker Bradley: "Is that in the Amendment?" 6358

30 Huskey: "Yes. Keep on...Keep on tongue wagging, burning up all the 6359

31 employment in Illinois so the funds of your rich unions can be 6360

32 used to help shovel up the ashes. Employment can be 6361

33 accomplished only by a good business climate, not by destroying 6362

34 everything that has made Illinois such a great state for the 6363

35 small businessman. I move for your favorable consideration." 6364

36 Speaker Bradley: "Do you want a Roll Call or voice vote?" 6366

1 Huskey: "Roll Call. Roll Call Mr. Speaker." 6368

2 Speaker Bradley: "Are you supported by five members? The question 6369  
3 is, shall the motion be adopted? All in favor signify by 6370  
4 voting 'aye', oppose by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? 6371  
5 Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. 6372  
6 There are 74 'ayes' 93 'nays'. The Gentleman's motion fails 6373  
7 and the machine just broke. Further Amendments." 6374

8 Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #10. Huskey. Amends Senate Bill 1331 6375  
9 on...." 6376

10 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Borchers on a point of order. What's your 6377  
11 point sir?" 6378

12 Borchers: "My point is this. I was noticing Representative 6379  
13 Matijevich whose name I just mentioned, speaking a short time 6380  
14 ago in relation to...." 6381

15 Speaker Bradley: "What's your point...what's your point Mr. 6382  
16 Borchers?" 6383

17 Borchers: "That he refused me, like you are right now, permission and 6384  
18 right to the other day on one of the House Bills, I don't 6385  
19 remember the number, for verification and a right to explain my 6386  
20 vote. And I think it is one of the kettle calling the...let's 6387  
21 see...what is that old saying...the kettle calling the pot 6388  
22 black...that's it." 6389

23 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane. For what 6390  
24 purpose do you rise?" 6392

25 Kane: "Mr. Speaker, we have a lot of work to do and I think that 6393  
26 every time that the Representative from Macon County wants to 6394  
27 speak, he should speak, but not ask for recognition. Just talk 6395  
28 to his neighbors." 6396

29 Speaker Bradley: "Point well made. Further Amendments." 6398

30 Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #10. Huskey. Amends Senate Bill 1331..." 6399

31 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey on Amendment #10." 6401

32 Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 6403  
33 Before July in 1975, an employee who didn't cross a picket 6404  
34 line, or who was locked out by his or her employer in a labor 6405  
35 dispute, was ineligible for...Mr. Speaker, could I have 6406  
36 order?" 6407

- 1 Speaker Bradley: "Let's give the Gentleman some order." 6409
- 2 Huskey: "You know, it would be nice if we could legislate from inside 6410  
3 of these walls, instead of taking orders from outside these 6411  
4 walls. Before July, 1975...Mr. Speaker, I am not going to 6412  
5 continue while all the whistling and stuff is going on. I 6413  
6 would like to have order." 6414
- 7 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Huskey, let's give the Gentleman some order. 6415  
8 Proceed sir." 6416
- 9 Huskey: "Before July, 1975, an employee who didn't cross a picket 6417  
10 line...Mr. Speaker, could I have order? Could I have the 6418  
11 courtesy in this House that I give these Gentlemen when they're 6419  
12 on the floor? I give them the courtesy, I should receive the 6420  
13 same courtesy." 6421
- 14 Speaker Bradley: "Proceed sir." 6423
- 15 Huskey: "Before July, 1975, an employee who did not cross the picket 6424  
16 line or who was locked out by his or her employer in a labor 6425  
17 dispute was ineligible for unemployment insurance benefits. 6426  
18 Now, most states do not allow an individual who doesn't cross a 6427  
19 picket line to claim benefits. Actually, none. This, allowing 6428  
20 such claims as for this Bill may be a savings to a deficit 6429  
21 ridden trust fund which would prevent employers such as in the 6430  
22 case of the Olin Corporation, Granite City from subsidising 6431  
23 strikes against themselves. Now let me say, Illinois is the 6432  
24 only state that does this and I would like to have you approve 6433  
25 Senate Bill #10, which would eliminate this. I move for your 6434  
26 favorable consideration." 6434
- 27 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike." 6436
- 28 McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 6437  
29 House. The Gentleman was correct that previous to 1975...when 6438  
30 this was not law, you had to prove that you had a life 6439  
31 threatening situation...had to exist and that was valid reason 6440  
32 for not crossing a picket line. I guess that's making it 6441  
33 pretty tough to prove that your life is in danger. Under 6442  
34 today's law, it says that failure to cross the picket line is 6443  
35 not in and of itself reason to deny an individual unemployment 6444  
36 insurance. Now, management says that, under today's law, 6444

1 the...they are being forced to subsidize the strike against 6445  
 2 themselves. We know the hearing in Chicago on this point...and  
 3 the company that was involved was a good example. The company 6446  
 4 that was involved and has been used as an example over and over 6447  
 5 is a recipient of large government contracts. And so I simply 6448  
 6 asked the employment...the employer representatives at the 6449  
 7 meeting if they...if they thought that the government contracts 6450  
 8 and the accelerated depreciation and any other tax benefits 6451  
 9 that are accruing to the employer should be taken away during  
 10 the strike because those people that are on strike, indeed 6452  
 11 those people that are honoring the picket lines who are not 6453  
 12 involved with the strike, they pay taxes to the government and 6454  
 13 their taxes are being used to subsidize the strike...the 6455  
 14 employer during the strike. And of course, there was no answer  
 15 to that question by the members of the...of the employer 6456  
 16 community. They don't mind if those on strike subsidize the 6457  
 17 employer, but they certainly don't want the employer to 6458  
 18 subsidize the employee. They like to have their cake and eat 6459  
 19 it too. For that and the other reasons previously given, I  
 20 hope that you vote against this Amendment." 6461

21 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Hudson." 6463  
 22 Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 6464  
 23 House. I think that Amendment #10 illustrates rather lucidly, 6465  
 24 clearly how far out of wack this unemployment compensation 6466  
 25 business has gotten. Representative McPike is referring to the 6467  
 26 only manufacturing company, a company of five or six thousand 6468  
 27 employees roughly speaking, that was literally shut down 6469  
 28 because one group of employees represented by one union decided  
 29 to go out on strike. Okay, so then the rest joined in, and we 6471  
 30 had thirty-five hundred or four thousand other employees who 6472  
 31 refused to go to work and still drew unemployment compensation.  
 32 But I hasten to make the point that the work was there to be 6473  
 33 done. A job was there, this wasn't, this wasn't a case of 6474  
 34 anything other than these employees out of sympathy with a 6475  
 35 union that had nothing directly to do with them or with their 6476  
 36 union. Entering in on a sympathy basis, deciding not to cross 6477

1 the line and therefore not to go to work. And I think it is 6477  
2 highly unfair, it's unjust for the employee to have to pay 6478  
3 wages, and that particular company, yes, it may have government 6479  
4 contracts, but I will, I will submit to you, Ladies and 6480  
5 Gentlemen of this House, that no company, I don't care what the 6481  
6 contracts, government, private, or otherwise, I don't care what  
7 the contracts are if that company is shut down because the 6482  
8 workers won't come to work when the work is there, that company 6483  
9 isn't going to produce the product, and that company will not 6484  
10 for very long hold those contracts if it cannot produce as it 6485  
11 should. I think that this Amendment is one of the most 6486  
12 reasonable ones, I had a Bill to this effect, of course, it got  
13 nowhere. But I would urge you, Ladies and Gentlemen, to 6487  
14 realize that when this can happen, almost anything can happen. 6488  
15 The costs are going up, and I'm going to suggest another thing. 6489  
16 We're talking about the possibility of collective bargaining in 6490  
17 a public sector. And if this principle holds the sympathy 6491  
18 strike, you're going to see something in the State of Illinois, 6492  
19 the likes of which you haven't beheld before. You're going to 6493  
20 see schools literally closed down, because perhaps the 6494  
21 janitors' union goes on strike. It may represent a handful of 6495  
22 employees in a given school, but none of the school teachers 6496  
23 will come to strike...will come to school and come to teach, 6497  
24 because they don't want to cross the picket line. Well, I kid 6498  
25 you not, Ladies and Gentlemen, you can go ahead and you can  
26 vote Amendments of this kind down, but the day will come when 6499  
27 the piper will have to be paid. And the piper, or course, is 6500  
28 the taxpayer of the State of Illinois, it's the businessman of 6501  
29 the State of Illinois. This is a reasonable Amendment, it's 6502  
30 one that deserves to be supported regardless of how you may  
31 feel on some of the other aspects of this whole business. I 6503  
32 think Representative Huskey is doing us a favor to bring this 6504  
33 Amendment to our attention, and I would urge you, my colleagues, 6505  
34 my esteemed and respected colleagues, I would urge you to give 6506  
35 this your real consideration and your green vote." 6507

36 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino." 6509

1 Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I've heard a lot of rhetoric 6510  
2 concerning this Amendment. I think something should be said to 6511  
3 clarify the existing law. The two cases in question, Owen 6512  
4 Manufacturing and Tally Industries were decided upon a class 6513  
5 action hearing, judicially whether or not those people were 6514  
6 eligible for unemployment compensation who did not cross the 6515  
7 picket line. But more recently the Illinois Cement case of 6516  
8 LaSalle, Illinois, it was brought out that if in fact, an 6517  
9 organization was involved in a work stoppage based on an 6518  
10 economic concern only. Those members will be, and will 6519  
11 continue to be ineligible for any benefits. Therefore, the 6520  
12 decision affecting Illinois Cement affects every other company 6521  
13 in the State of Illinois, and I think your Amendment is 6522  
14 innocuous, because it is a class action, and that case pointed 6523  
15 out that if in fact, economic incentives were the only reason 6524  
16 for a work stoppage, there would be no unemployment 6525  
17 compensation. Therefore, I don't think it's needed, and that 6526  
18 is the law." 6527

19 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Yourell." 6528

20 Yourell: "I move the previous question." 6529

21 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The 6530  
22 question is shall the main question be put, all in favor 6531  
23 signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Mr. 6532  
24 Huskey to close." 6533

25 Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 6534  
26 again I listen to the fancy soothsayers on the other side 6535  
27 promoting the death of business in Illinois. The death of 6536  
28 business is the death of the employment, I watch them move out 6537  
29 everyday, go ahead whistle your dumb votes, but all you're 6538  
30 hurting is yourselves, that's all you're hurting. You're 6539  
31 putting your neighbors out of work because no employment, no 6540  
32 job, they'll be no more union dues, you won't get your big 6541  
33 luses...contributions from the unions, because the money won't 6542  
34 be there to give it to you. I would urge a no vote on this 6543  
35 Bill." 6544

36 Speaker Bradley: "No votes, all in favor of the Gentleman's 6545

1 motion...signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Bus 6545

2 Yourell wants a transcript of the last statement. The 6546

3 Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, to explain his vote." 6547

4 Leinenweber: "Yea, I heard ridiculous analogy, their attempt at an 6548

5 analogy of my life, Representative McPike has to be about as 6549

6 ridiculous as he can get. I just reminded the Gentleman 6550

7 there's a difference between a sale price of a product and a 6551

8 subsidy. If you want to talk about eliminating subsidies 6552

9 through companies during a strike, I'd be all for you. But 6553

10 that's a terrible idea to give subsidies to begin with. But 6554

11 we're not talking about subsidies except in the situation of 6555

12 the unemployment compensation." 6555

13 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 6556

14 The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 73 6557

15 'ayes', 89 'nos' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further 6558

16 Amendments?" 6559

17 Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #11, Huskey, amends Senate Bill 1631..." 6561

18 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey." 6563

19 Huskey: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these 6564

20 Amendments are getting better all the time. I would hope to 6565

21 see more green votes up there. Please be advised that this 6566

22 Amendment does the following: it reduces by thirteen weeks the 6567

23 number of weeks an individual will be eligible to receive 6568

24 benefits if the individual voluntarily quits his or her job 6569

25 without good cause, is discharged for misconduct or refuses 6570

26 suitable work. Let me repeat that. Quits his or her job 6571

27 without good cause, is discharged for misconduct, or refuses 6572

28 suitable work. Currently the maximum number of weeks an 6573

29 individual can receive is thirty-six weeks, is twenty-six 6574

30 weeks, I beg your pardon. The Bill already, the Bureau of 6573

31 Employment Security estimates that this could be a savings of 6574

32 84.6 million to the Illinois Press Fund, that is \$946,000,000 6575

33 in debt to the Federal Government. And let me explain one more 6575

34 thing, this so called agreed Bill that was brought outside of 6576

35 these walls, that these Legislators had nothing to do with is 6577

36 increasing the small businessman's unemployment tax 25%. Don't 6578

1 forget that, everytime you vote that red vote, you're 6579  
 2 increasing the small businessman's unemployment insurance 25%.

3 Mr. Speaker, I move for the favorable adoption of this 6580  
 4 Amendment." 6581

5 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan." 6583

6 Hanahan: "Will the Gentleman yield?" 6585

7 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Huskey, would you yield to a question, Sir?" 6587

8 Huskey: "Yes, I would." 6589

9 Hanahan: "Mr. Huskey, I notice that you're a small businessman, and 6590

10 you're speaking in behalf of small businessmen, and you've 6591

11 alluded to at least three or four times in this Amendment how 6592

12 businesses has really been hurt in Illinois. I was wondering 6593

13 if you'd tell the General Assembly how much your business has 6594

14 expanded since the passage of House Bill, er Senate Bill 285 6595

15 and Senate Bill 235 and 236 in 1975..." 6596

16 Huskey: "I have one store left, Representative Hanahan...and I had to 6597

17 close the store due to high unemployment insurance rates." 6599

18 Hanahan: "I understand just the opposite has happened, I'd hate 6600

19 to..." 6601

20 Huskey: "I would ask you to go to 115th in Harlem, and there you'll 6602

21 see an empty building like you'll see here on 11th Street in 6603

22 Springfield, empty factories up and down the road, because the 6604

23 factories have left and gone to other states that closed up and 6605

24 went out of business..." 6606

25 Hanahan: "But I...corporate store and a few others that I see you're 6607

26 involved in, it's odd that in speaking to this Amendment that 6608

27 you'd use a rationalization..." 6609

28 Huskey: "Pardon me, Mr. Hanahan..." 6611

29 Speaker Bradley: "Hold it, for what purpose does the Gentleman from 6612

30 Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman arise?" 6614

31 Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the author of the famous 6615

32 Hanahan rules for the House, and I would think that he would 6616

33 have more respect for the rules of the House and to question a 6617

34 member of this House on his own business activities, which have 6618

35 absolutely nothing to do with this Amendment, I'd rule him out 6619

36 of order." 6620



1 Speaker Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Hanahan." 6622

2 Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I think that's real 'apropos' because when a, 6624

3 when a Gentleman generally speaks on this floor to the House it 6625

4 is with conflict. There isn't a member of this House that 6626

5 hasn't got some forms of conflicts of interest, specifically 6627

6 our experience levels wherever we're from. We all vote on 6628

7 farm issues if we're farmers and we speak on them, we speak on 6629

8 working issues and we're working men. We speak on insurance 6629

9 issues if we're insurance men. We speak on small business 6630

10 problems, and I think that's what Representative Huskey is 6631

11 trying to do. I'd just like to suggest that his 6632

12 rationalization..." 6632

13 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hanahan...Mr. Schuneman, what..." 6634

14 Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, what order are we on now, Mr. Speaker. 6635

15 Don't the rules apply to all of us, Mr. Speaker." 6637

16 Bradley: "Amendment #11, Mr. Hanahan, would you confine your remarks 6638

17 to Amendment #11, please." 6640

18 Hanahan: "So in explaining Amendment #11, part of my feelings on why 6641

19 I am voting no on this Bill and encouraging a no vote is 6642

20 because I come from the people that receive the benefits, not 6643

21 the business community that may pay part of the tax towards the 6644

22 benefit. And I'm very concerned with an Amendment of this 6646

23 nature and the rationalization of where it came from and 6647

24 wh..what is the rationalization of why it is proposed. I 6647

25 suggest that the Gentleman explained very...full well why he 6648

26 proposed the Amendment. He is concerned about the small 6649

27 businessmen. He said that in his statement that he's concerned 6651

28 about the small businessman. And I'm concerned about the small 6651

29 businessmen because of the employees that may or may not 6652

30 receive the unemployment compensation based on Amendment #11 to 6653

31 this Bill. It's a bad Amendment, and he knows full well that 6654

32 what do people do with these amounts of money they receive, and 6654

33 when you deny them thirteen weeks of unemployment benefits 6655

34 who's going to pay the grocer and who's going to pay the doctor 6656

35 bills and the rent? Who's going to pay that automobile repair 6657

36 bill for the part that they charge to fix a car? You're 6658

1 talking about working people who don't need to fix a car, they 6658  
 2 won't be able to afford to go out and buy a new one. So I 6659  
 3 think the Gentleman should use the full experience of being a 6660  
 4 small businessman, a vote not only selling, but seeing who is 6661  
 5 buying and their experiences of having an ability to buy even 6662  
 6 though they may be unemployed. It's very unusual for a man to 6663  
 7 say that he comes only from one section, only from one 6664  
 8 viewpoint, that he's only concerned about the small 6665  
 9 businessman, when truly he should be just as concerned about 6666  
 10 all those wage earners in his legislative district. I notice 6666  
 11 his other two colleagues are worried. It's odd that he's not 6667  
 12 as worried about those wage earners who may be unemployed and 6667  
 13 denied under this Amendment thirteen weeks of unemployment 6668  
 14 compensation to pay the grocery bills and to pay for the bills 6669  
 15 of repairing a car. I ask for a no vote." 6670

16 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson." 6672

17 Johnson: "We all know how all of these things are going to come out, 6673  
 18 and who's going to vote what way, so I move the previous 6674  
 19 question." 6675

20 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question, all in 6676  
 21 favor of the Gentleman's motion, say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 6677  
 22 'ayes' have it, Mr. Huskey to close the debate." 6679

23 Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I ah, I've got to say that the man that 6680  
 24 stood up with a conflict of interest, I'm sure that he has no 6681  
 25 conflict of interest, I'm sure that he doesn't draw any funds, 6682  
 26 or isn't any president of any union or anything of that type. 6683  
 27 I'm sure that he is doing all this out of his heart, ah, 6684  
 28 supporting these union causes out of the generosity of his 6685  
 29 heart, I'm certain he has no benefits any other way. I am 6686  
 30 certainly...if I were a Legislator maybe from the City of 6686  
 31 Chicago or the County of Cook from say the other side of the 6688  
 32 aisle, why I could go to Chicago and get a job, or in Cook 6689  
 33 County to get a job, so be a so called double dipper to makeup 6689  
 34 the deficit that I am not making as a small businessman. Maybe 6690  
 35 I could stand up and cry that way too, but I'm a small 6691  
 36 businessman, so I had to get a job as a State Representative to 6692

1 subsidize my income. But we're missing the point, I want to  
2 talk to the Amendment. Ah, Representative Hanahan, a fancy  
3 soothsayer..."

4 Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me just a minute, Mr. Huskey, what purpose  
5 does the Lady from Cook, Miss Barnes rise?"

6 Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like Representative Huskey to  
7 contain his remarks to the issues and not to the Legislators  
8 and their districts."

9 Speaker Bradley: "I think the point is well made."

10 Huskey: "The...I do want to get back to the Amendment, that's what  
11 I wanted to get back to and I'm just answering the question that  
12 was asked me by the, as I say, one of the fancy soothsayers  
13 that are representing labor on the other side. Now I didn't  
14 say that this Amendment applies to everyone, I want to repeat  
15 again what this Amendment applies to. This Amendment applies  
16 to the individual that voluntarily quits his or her job  
17 without, without good cause. It also covers the person that is  
18 discharged for misconduct. That's all it does, a few reasons  
19 and refuses suitable work, and refuses suitable work. Just  
20 those two things, that's all this Amendment does. It is a  
21 person that is...quits without good cause and is voluntarily  
22 discharged for misconduct and refuses to accept suitable work.  
23 Now that's all it does, it's a fair Amendment and I move for  
24 its adoption."

25 Speaker Bradley: "The question's on the adoption of the Amendment.  
26 All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'.  
27 The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell to explain his vote."

28 Yourell "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the  
29 House, the Gentleman who proposed the Amendment, the author of  
30 the Amendment referred to double dipping, and I am one of those  
31 that he referred to of course, but he seems to forget when he  
32 first came to the General Assembly he too was a double dipper,  
33 and because he didn't choose to run again for that other spot,  
34 he then is no longer a double dipper. And I can't see for the  
35 life of me, how he's going to use all these Roll Calls that he  
36 indicates he's going to use in the district, when he can't

1 convince his own running mate to go along with him." 6730

2 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 6731  
3 record. On this question there's 71 'ayes', 86 'nays' and the 6732  
4 motion failed. Further Amendments?" 6734

5 Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #12, Huskey, amends Senate Bill 1331 in 6735  
6 Section 500 and so forth." 6737

7 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Huskey." 6739

8 Huskey: "Alright, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 6740  
9 could I have order, Mr. Speaker." 6742

10 Speaker Bradley: "You have order, Sir." 6744

11 Huskey: "I saved the best Amendment for the last, Mr. Speaker. Mr. 6745  
12 Speaker, Amendment #12 provides that those out-of-state 6746  
13 benefits' recipients must report to an Illinois Employment 6747  
14 Office every thirty days to have their eligibility for benefits 6748  
15 reviewed. Now, now the Employment Office does have the 6749  
16 authority to call them in for review, but they don't use that  
17 authority, very seldom, and this is to provide that these 6750  
18 people that go to other states and to other places to spend 6751  
19 their money that take out of Illinois that they receive 6752  
20 unemployed benefits, to bring them back every thirty days to 6753  
21 see if they're anxiously wanting to go to work. See if they're  
22 seeking work. Unemployment insurance is only designed to tide 6754  
23 you over between jobs. It isn't designed to give you a 6755  
24 twenty-six week vacation in Florida or California or Arizona. 6756  
25 It's designed to cover and help you out between jobs. So if 6757  
26 you would, if they would bring them in every thirty days just  
27 to review their eligibility, it would've saved the State 6758  
28 \$50,635,154 a year. I move for its favorable adoption." 6760

29 Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike." 6762

30 McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 6763  
31 when people are laid off in Illinois, indeed they do seek 6764  
32 employment in various states. And the State of Illinois mailed 6765  
33 checks out of our state to the amount of about \$45,000,000 a 6766  
34 year to those people seeking employment in other states. But 6767  
35 the same thing happens to those people that are laid off in the 6768  
36 other states in this country. They come to Illinois, they come

1 to Illinois from Wisconsin looking for work. They come from 6769  
 2 Ohio looking for work. They come from every state in the union 6770  
 3 to Illinois looking for work. And into this State is mailed 6771  
 4 approximately \$50,000,000 a year from various other states. So 6772  
 5 it's really a 'wash', we mail checks out of state, and other 6773  
 6 states mail checks in State. We do this to conform to a  
 7 federal law. And if we go out of conformity, this Amendment 6774  
 8 could cost the State approximately \$800,000,000." 6776

9 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins on the 6777  
 10 Amendment. I just called on Mr. Robbins." 6779

11 Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, I really don't think that we should vote green 6780  
 12 on this thing at all, I don't think we should have them spend 6781  
 13 the extra fuel to come back whenever they want. Spend the 6782  
 14 winter in Arizona, well, let them spend the winter in Arizona. 6783  
 15 We have a fast growing company called World Color Press in our 6784  
 16 area. Their employment has increased every year that they have 6785  
 17 been there, and their unemployment insurance has increased to 6786  
 18 where it is running almost 10% of what they pay in wages. Now  
 19 whenever they have work to do, and people to do the work, it is 6787  
 20 really a shame it's that way, but I don't blame some people for 6788  
 21 wanting to go to Arizona, so I think it's a really a good...I 6789  
 22 really think we should vote no on this Amendment, and keep them 6790  
 23 out there in the sun so they won't get in the way of people who 6791  
 24 want to work." 6792

25 Bradley: "Mr. Huskey to close the debate." 6794

26 Huskey: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there was 6795  
 27 out-of-state claims for a total of \$44,847,792 based on 6796  
 28 benefits of out-of-state claimants last year. Now Texas, 6797  
 29 California and Florida were the, were the top three states that 6798  
 30 benefits were sent to. The average, the average out-of-state  
 31 'receptient' was seventeen weeks, so they weren't looking for 6799  
 32 work very hard. The average person receiving benefits 6800  
 33 out-of-state was seventeen weeks. It would be nice if we could 6801  
 34 just go to some...to ah, in the winter time, go to one of the 6802  
 35 sun-belt states and have a check sent to us there. That's 6803  
 36 exactly what's happening, and Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to

1 the small business people in the State of Illinois, for the 6804  
 2 business climate in the State of Illinois, I think this is an 6805  
 3 Amendment that should be adopted. Thank you." 6806

4 Speaker Bradley: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. All in 6807  
 5 favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have 6808  
 6 all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this 6809  
 7 question there's 60 'ayes', 93 'nos'. The motion fails. 6810  
 8 Further Amendments?" 6811

9 Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #13, Deuster, amends Senate Bill 1331 by 6812  
 10 deleting lines 28 through 34 and so forth." 6814

11 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Deuster." 6816

12 Deuster: "Yes, if there's any small way to shed any light on this 6817  
 13 subject or any happiness, I'd like to withdraw Amendment #13 6818  
 14 and also withdraw 14." 6819

15 Speaker Bradley: Does the Gentleman have leave to withdraw the 6820  
 16 Amendment? Hearing no objection, the Amendment's withdrawn. 6821  
 17 Further Amendments?" 6822

18 Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #14, Deuster." 6824

19 Speaker Bradley: "Both of them, withdrew both of them?" 6826

20 Deuster: "Yea." 6828

21 Speaker Bradley: "Fine. Further Amendments?" 6830

22 Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments." 6832

23 Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. Back to concurrences, on page 8, we 6833  
 24 left off with Mr. Kempiners...waiting, House Bill 666, the 6834  
 25 Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners." 6836

26 Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the 6837  
 27 House, House Bill 666 when it was here in the House, clarified 6838  
 28 that a road district highway commissioner was included in the 6839  
 29 provisions of the law along with other units of local 6840  
 30 government highway commissioners. And it was put in to clarify 6841  
 31 a State's Attorney's opinion in DuPage County that a highway 6842  
 32 commissioner was indeed a local highway official. In the 6843  
 33 Senate, we...House Bill 666 amended three portions of the law, 6843  
 34 and in the Senate they took out what we had amended and amended 6844  
 35 one portion that would cover everything else, so that the 6845  
 36 Amendment did not make any change in the intent of the Bill, 6846

1 but it cleaned up the changes that would be made in the Statute 6846  
 2 book. Before offering the Amendment, the Transportation 6847  
 3 Committee Staff did check with all the interested groups and 6848  
 4 they are in concurrence with it, so I would move that we concur 6849  
 5 with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 666." 6850

6 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House concurs with 6851  
 7 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 666. The Gentleman from 6852  
 8 Cook, Mr. Getty." 6853

9 Getty: "Will the Gentleman yield? Ah, Bill, is it the legislative 6854  
 10 intent here to give the highway ah, commissioners police 6855  
 11 ordinance powers, is that the purpose?" 6857

12 Kempiners: "I'm not quite sure what you meant by the question, but 6858  
 13 what the situation was we're trying to correct is that because 6859  
 14 the highway commissioner had not specifically been outlined in 6860  
 15 the definition of what, you know ah, and people having the 6861  
 16 power to post weight limitations, that sort of thing. The 6862  
 17 State's Attorney in DuPage County said he would not prosecute,  
 18 therefore the Sheriff would not enforce these provisions. So 6863  
 19 basically what we're doing is just including him as, just like 6864  
 20 a county or municipal road authority." 6865

21 Getty: "It appears at least in the Amendment, that you're amending 6866  
 22 Article 11 which would seem to give the Highway Commissioner 6867  
 23 authority to post speed limits as well as weight restrictions." 6868

24 Kempiners: "That was again, Mr. Getty, all I can say is that was not 6870  
 5 the intent of the Bill. The intent of the Bill was with regard 6871  
 6 to the weight limitations of the road, and there was one group 6872  
 7 that was somewhat concerned about, the Illinois Agricultural 6873  
 8 Association. And I have kept in touch with them throughout the 6874  
 9 passage of this Bill, because of their concern and at the time 6875  
 0 this Amendment was adopted, I asked the Senate Staff if they 6876  
 1 checked with IAA to get their concurrence in this Amendment, 6877  
 2 and he assured me that he did. Ah, well, that's the best way I 6878  
 3 can answer your question." 6879

4 Getty: "As the Bill left the House, I believe it amended Article 15 6880  
 5 which would have been okay, it would have done exactly what you 6881  
 6 wanted. But I am fearful that you've expanded it substantially 6882

1 by the Senate Amendment amending Article 11. I just, I really 6883  
 2 have that question, I don't think that the views expressed, 6884  
 3 that's your legislative intent, and as I read it, at least at 6885  
 4 this point, and our staff seems to agree, that you are  
 5 expanding it, I'm just wondering if maybe you ought to...not 6886  
 6 to...take it out of the record and let's be sure before we pass 6887  
 7 it." 6888

8 Kempiners: "That's fine with me, because again that is not my 6889  
 9 intent." 6890

10 Getty: "Okay, why don't we just take it out the record and see if we 6891  
 11 can clear it up." 6892

12 Speaker Bradley: "Take it out of the record. House Bill 676. The 6893  
 13 Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Wolf." 6895

14 Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate Amendment 6896  
 15 #2 to House Bill 676. This is strictly a technical correction. 6897  
 16 It does add one section which provides that the county board of 6898  
 17 counties less than 150,000 can at the request of the county 6899  
 18 collector designate a state, a savings and loan association for 6900  
 19 the depository of public funds, and I would move to concur to 6901  
 20 Senate Amendment #2." 6902

21 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to concur. The Gentleman from 6903  
 22 Cook, Mr. Totten." 6904

23 Totten: "Well, Mr. Speaker, um, our staff has uncovered a technical 6905  
 24 defect in the Amendment, and I wonder if the sponsor would pull 6906  
 25 it out of the record to see if we can correct it." 6908

26 Speaker Bradley: "Want it out of the record, Mr. Wolf?" 6910

27 Wolf: "Take it out of the record, Mr. Speaker." 6912

28 Speaker Bradley: "Take it out of the record. 692, Mr. Marovitz." 6914

29 Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I would move that the 6915  
 30 House do concur with ah, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 692. 6916  
 31 This is an Amendment that was suggested by the insurance 6917  
 32 companies and the insurance committee and which we agreed to. 6918  
 33 They wrote the Amendments themselves, ah, and it says that ah, 6919  
 34 any attempt to rehabilitate would be determined by certificate 6920  
 35 from a licensed contractor or architect, and such 6920  
 36 rehabilitative effort shall be done in compliance with local 6921



1 municipal building codes, the Department of Insurance, ah, 6922  
 2 Committee to the Department of Insurance. The insurance 6923  
 3 companies all agreed to this Amendment, and I would ask for  
 4 concurrence of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 692." 6925

5 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to concur. The Gentleman from 6926  
 6 DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen." 6928

7 Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I apologize, I think there's a technical 6929  
 8 error in the Amendment. It might be a good idea if you take it 6930  
 9 out of the record at this point, get that correct before we go 6931  
 10 any further, if the Sponsor would do that." 6933

11 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Marovitz, take it out of the record? Turn Mr. 6934  
 12 Marovitz on." 6935

13 Marovitz: "As a courtesy to Mr. Ebbesen, I will take the Bill out of 6936  
 14 the record and ah, get the...if we can get back to it, Mr. 6937  
 15 Speaker." 6938

16 Speaker Bradley: "Take it out of the record. Take it out of the 6939  
 17 record. Ah, House Bill 751, Mr. Steele, Steele-Kelly, Mr. 6940  
 18 Steele." 6941

19 Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House ah, concur 6942  
 20 with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 751. Senate Amendment 2 6943  
 21 modifies and reduces the amounts originally provided for in 6944  
 22 House Bill 751. I feel that this legislation is still very 6945  
 23 meaningful, it's effective, which goes a long way towards 6946  
 24 accomplishing the purposes, and the intents of the Bill. And I 6947  
 25 do move that we concur and adopt ah, this motion." 6948

26 Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House concurs in Senate 6949  
 27 Amendment #2 to House Bill 751. All in favor of the 6950  
 28 Gentleman's motion, signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 6951  
 29 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. 6952  
 30 Getty." 6953

31 Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my 'no' vote. You vote 'no' 6954  
 32 on this, you're voting to put a cap at thirty minutes on the 6955  
 33 amount that they ah, railroad to be fined for blocking the 6956  
 34 crossing. So once you reach thirty minutes, there's absolutely 6957  
 35 no motivation for the railroad to move. They might as well 6958  
 36 stay there, cause the fines never go any further, Now, I don't 6959

1 know how your areas are, but in the south suburban area that I 69  
2 represent, we have some real problems with trains blocking 69  
3 intersections all the time. So here, if you reach the thirty 69  
4 minute mark, then you might as well keep that train there for 69  
5 forty-five minutes or an hour or until you're darn good and 69  
6 ready to move it, because the fine can't go up anymore. So I'm 69  
7 going to vote no on this, I think that's the right vote, I 69  
8 think we should nonconcur and keep a good scale on this." 69

9 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Yes, the Gentleman from 69  
10 DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen to explain his vote." 69

11 Ebbesen: "Ah, yes, I'd like to concur with what the Representative 69  
12 Getty has said. You know, I think that ah, we should really 69  
13 nonconcur and give this further study. I really, ah, we have a 69  
14 situation in the City of DeKalb where when those railroad 69  
15 trains block those crossings, it represents a dangerous 69  
16 situation, that's out in the so called boonies. And I can 69  
17 imagine what it's like in a suburban Cook County area, and I 69  
18 think that we ought to really follow suit with a recommendation 69  
19 of Representative Getty and then nonconcur." 69

20 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Steele to explain his 69  
21 vote." 69

22 Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, this Bill 69  
23 provides some very needed and important protections to the 69  
24 people of this state that they do not have at the present time. 69  
25 People of this state are desperately in need of some 69  
26 legislation that will enforce and make meaningful the existing 69  
27 ten minute violation law where the trains block crossings. 69  
28 This pertains throughout the State of Illinois. Now this Bill 69  
29 puts some real teeth into it. Now it's not quite as strong as 69  
30 we'd like to have it, but I tell you, it really provides the 69  
31 protection for the people, because it says after ten minutes a 69  
32 fine of some 200 to 500 shall be imposed. It says that after 69  
33 fifteen minutes, a fine of \$500 shall be imposed, and after 69  
34 thirty minutes a \$1,000 shall be imposed. And I say to you, 69  
35 that this takes it out of the discretionary right of the judge 69  
36 to give a slap on the wrist and not enforce meaningful crime. 69

1 So it says shall be imposed, it's almost an automatic fine when 6994  
 2 the railroad crossings are blocked beyond the legal limit. I  
 3 say it's good legislation, it's the best that the Senate would 6995  
 4 approve. It gives the people protection they haven't had 6996  
 5 before, and until we can strengthen it further, perhaps next 6997  
 6 session, I say it's important to get this on the books so that 6998  
 7 the people do have protection, and I urge your support and your 6999  
 8 green light." 7000

9 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow to 7001  
 10 explain his vote." 7002

11 Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 7003  
 12 on these concurrences, we often sit here and just agree with 7004  
 13 the sponsor and vote 'aye' without really thinking about it. 7005  
 14 Here we have a situation where a train can block an 7006  
 15 intersection for a long period of time, say thirty minutes. 7007  
 16 And the sponsor says, well, that's going to be a \$1,000 fine. 7008  
 17 Well not necessarily, it could be \$5, \$10 or whatever the judge 7009  
 18 wanted to access. The maximum would be a \$1,000. But if that 7010  
 19 train stays there for thirty-five minutes or forty-five or an 7011  
 20 hour or two hours, then there's no fine, there's no offense. 7012  
 21 That's the trouble with this Amendment. Evidently the railroad 7013  
 22 lobbyists are strong in the Senate and they're trying us to see 7014  
 23 if we're just as strong. I think we ought to defeat this 7015  
 24 Amendment, send it back it back to the Senate and tell them 7016  
 25 we're not going to move, that we want the train to keep going, 7017  
 26 not to block these intersections, not to deprive our citizens 7018  
 27 of vital services, so that our ambulances and fire trucks can 7019  
 28 get around. And I can't believe that Representative Steele is 7020  
 29 just laying down and taking this. I know how hard he fought 7021  
 30 for this Bill. I think we ought to give him another chance. 7022  
 31 We ought to reject this, send it back to the Senate and stiffen 7023  
 32 the Bill. I would solicit a 'no' vote. Thank you." 7024

33 Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 7025  
 34 The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti to explain his vote." 7026

35 Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am 7027  
 36 certainly grateful to Mr. Getty calling this to my attention. 7028

1 This will pre-empt the Home Rule Committee like I have, and I 7028  
 2 passed this ordinance about five or six years ago. And I...if 7029  
 3 this becomes law, then my ordinance that I have on my books 7030  
 4 is...I've got a graduated fine, this will limit them to a 7031  
 5 \$1,000 fine. My ordinance has been working and working very 7032  
 6 effectively, because it is a graduated fine. And I get them 7033  
 7 out of there in ten or twenty minutes. But if this is allowed 7034  
 8 to pass and become law, at all municipalities...that creature 7035  
 9 of the General Assenby ah, I'm afraid this will pre-empt home  
 10 rules in the City of Chicago and those that are home rules. I 7035  
 11 say you should vote against this Bill, reject this Amendment." 7036

12 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson to explain 7038  
 13 his vote." 7039

14 Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, 7040  
 15 Representative Steele has worked very hard on this Bill. It 7041  
 16 does the two things that a Bill should do in this area. Number 7042  
 17 one, it stiffens the fine so that there is a legitimate 7043  
 18 incentive not to block the railroads, and number two, it 7044  
 19 applies the fine in a reasonable fashion to the railroads not  
 20 to the engineers who have no choice in this matter when they're 7045  
 21 ordered to put a train in a certain place. It applies to the 7046  
 22 right, ah, to the right units, the railroad itself. The amount 7047  
 23 is proper, it's not excessive, but it is an substantial 7048  
 24 increase over the present fine. And I would urge a yes vote on 7049  
 25 this." 7050

26 Bradley: "It just slips under the postponed consideration number. 7051  
 27 The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff." 7053

28 Neff: "Ah, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 7054  
 29 House. Now the complaints that I have heard on this as it was 7055  
 30 a Senate Amendment is that it isn't strong enough. And I think 7056  
 31 that most of us agree, and I know Representative Steele agrees 7057  
 32 that he would like to have the legislation stronger. But many 7059  
 33 times we have to take a half a loaf when we can't get a full  
 34 loaf, and I think on this situation, we should be willing to 7060  
 35 accept the half loaf and get something started here, that we 7061  
 36 must all agree is a step in the right direction. And I would 7062

1 hope that we would get more 'aye' votes." 7063

2 Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Steele, substitute motion?" 7065

3 Steele: "Yes move nonconcur and a Conference Committee be appointed." 7066

4 Speaker Bradley: "Well, the ah, what will happen, he's moved to 7068

5 nonconcur, all in favor of the Gentleman's motion, say 'aye', 7069

6 opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and we, the House nonconcur 7071

7 on Senate Amendment. Ah, here the situation now, I explained 7072

8 earlier, where they may recede from, refuse to recede on the 7073

9 Amendment in the Senate, so there might not need a Conference

10 Committee. House Bill 828. Is Jake Wolf on the floor? House 7074

11 Bill 838, Sam Wolf. The Gentleman from Madison." 7076

12 Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to 7077

13 concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 838. This is 7078

14 strictly a technical correction in the Bill itself. It simply 7079

15 provides the authority for the Secretary of State to accept the 7080

16 \$200 basic fee in advance and to refund any excess charge that 7081

17 might be made as a result of the charges set up by this 7082

18 legislation, and I move to concur and solicit your favorable

19 support." 7083

20 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur with 7084

21 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 838, all in favor of the 7085

22 Gentleman's motion, signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 7086

23 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The 7087

24 Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 7088

25 180...154 'ayes', 1 'no', and the House does concur in Senate

26 Amendment #1 to House Bill 838. House Bill 851. The Gentleman 7089

27 from Cook, Mr. Schlickman." 7091

28 Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would move to 7092

29 concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 851. House Bill 7093

30 851 amends the Displaced Homemakers Act. In practice this Act 7094

31 has been administered by the Governor's Office of Manpower. 7095

32 The Statute provides for the Department of Labor. The Senate 7096

33 Amendment simply puts the law in concurrence or makes it 7097

34 consistent with practice. And I would solicit your favorable

35 support." 7098

36 Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten." 7100

1 Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a 7101  
2 question?" 7102

3 Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will." 7104

4 Totten: "If this program has been transferred from GOMHD to this new 7105  
5 act, how much money is going to be used to administer this new 7106  
6 act from the Department of Labor?" 7108

7 Schlickman: "This Bill itself is not an appropriation Bill. 7109  
8 Previously the House passed without the Senate as I recall, an 7110  
9 appropriation of \$300,000. What the status of that Bill in the 7111  
10 Senate is, I don't know." 7112

11 Totten: "Is the appropriation...is the money for this now in the 7113  
12 GOMHD budget? This is probably the worst place, everything 7114  
13 GOMHD does is screwed up." 7115

14 Schlickman: "Well, as I mentioned the Ho...Displaced Homemakers 7116  
15 Assistance Act is now being administered by GOMHD, and what 7117  
16 this Bill does is simply make consistent with practice that..." 7118

17 Totten: "My analysis says it goes from the Department of Labor to 7120  
18 GOMHD. Is that incorrect?" 7122

19 Schlickman: "That's exactly correct. What I said was that in fact 7123  
20 the program is being administered by GOMHD while technically by 7124  
21 Statute it is to be administered by the Department of Labor. 7125  
22 And what this Amendment does is simply to make the law 7126  
23 consistent with the practice." 7127

24 Totten: "Okay." 7129

25 Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from, the Lady from Cook, Mrs. 7130  
26 Macdonald." 7131

27 Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the 7132  
28 House, the Displaced Homemaker \$300,000 appropriation is now in 7133  
29 the Governor's budget. They do support it, and it is in the 7134  
30 Senate. It is on an omnibus Bill and it is, it's the last I 7135  
31 heard, it was due to be approved." 7136

32 Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is shall the House concur to Senate 7137  
33 Amendment #1 to House Bill 851. All in favor vote 'aye', all 7138  
34 opposed vote 'no'. Final passage. Have all voted who wish? 7139  
35 Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On 7140  
36 this question there's 146 'ayes', 8 'nos', none recorded as 7141

1 'present'. The House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to 7142  
 2 House Bill 851. The House is...and the Bill is now declared  
 3 passed." 7143

4 Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Lechowicz in the Chair." 7145

5 Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 163. The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. 7146  
 6 VonBoeckman." 7147

7 VonBoeckman: "Mr. Speaker, I think we got it clarified ah, on the 163 7148  
 8 which ah, the Amendment simply states, which is required by 7149  
 9 Federal and State Law to the placard when carrying hazardous 7150  
 10 materials defined in Illinois's Hazardous Materials 7151  
 11 Transportation Act approved August 26. What it does, it 7152  
 12 strikes all of the language that ah, tells what ah, the 7153  
 13 hazardous material is like liquid petroleum and all that. And 7153  
 14 it refers to the, the ah, Federal Act which carries about 1500 7154  
 15 different hazardous materials. So it doesn't take anything 7155  
 16 out, in fact it adds to it. And I ask for a favorable Roll 7156  
 17 Call on the concurrence of the Senate Amendment." 7157

18 Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is shall the House 7158  
 19 concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 163. All in favor 7159  
 20 vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Monroe, give me an 'aye'. 7160  
 21 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk 7161  
 22 will take the record. On this question there's 153 'ayes', no 7162  
 23 'nays' and none voting present. The House does concur in 7163  
 24 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 163 and is hereby declared 7163  
 25 passed. House Bill 882. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe." 7166

26 Jaffe: "House Bill 882 deals with counseling for alcohol on minors. 7167  
 27 And the Senate Amendment really tightens up the Bill 7168  
 28 tremendously. Basically what it does, it says in any instance 7169  
 29 in which a minor is being treated for alcohol, the parents have 7170  
 30 to be notified by the time of the second treatment unless that 7171  
 31 person treating him in that person's professional judgment, 7172  
 32 such notification would jeopardize the course of the treatment 7173  
 33 being pursued. However, in no case however, shall a period of 7173  
 34 more than three months elapse without the parents or guardian 7174  
 35 of said minor be notified of the treatment afforded. It 7175  
 36 tightens up the Bill quite a bit, but I'm going to move to 7176

1 concur in the Amendment. It's been agreed to I think, by the  
2 various people who are interested in this Bill and by the  
3 Medical Society, and I would ask for a move to concur in  
4 Amendment #1."

5 Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur with  
6 Amendment #1, Senate Amendment #1 of House Bill 882. Is there  
7 discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McCourt. McCourt."

8 McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?"

9 Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield."

10 McCourt: "What type of treatment might a minor be given for up to  
11 three months without any parental consent?"

12 Jaffe: "Well, as you know we're amending the Act concerning medical,  
13 dental and surgical procedures, and we're talking about  
14 treatment for alcoholism."

15 McCourt: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,  
16 this Bill got out of here, how I don't know. It is a terrible  
17 Bill. It is now back here, it is a terrible Bill. And the  
18 whole idea really is bad to think that, that ah, a doctor or  
19 someone, a clinical psychiatrist or someone like that could  
20 treat a minor throughout the three months without a parent or  
21 guardian being advised that their child is subjected to some  
22 sort of a disease or an illness or has some problem. This is  
23 ludicrous."

24 Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen."

25 Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question, please."

26 Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield."

27 Pullen: "Who is expected to pay for the treatment of the minor? Is  
28 it the parent?"

29 Jaffe: "That's not covered, Penny, by the Act."

30 Pullen: "Well, I think that possibly that would be the normal  
31 situation, and this Bill apparently calls for people to be  
32 obligated to pay for something that they don't even know  
33 they're getting. I urge everyone to vote 'no.'"

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

35 Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I arise to oppose  
36 concurrence, and I think every parent ought to take into



1 account exactly what this Amendment does. It provides that a 7220  
 2 minor above the age of twelve, a 12-year-old and above who is 7221  
 3 an alcoholic can be treated without notification to the parent.  
 4 And I ask you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, why should 7222  
 5 we as a matter of public policy allow an alcoholic at age 7223  
 6 twelve or over to be treated without parental notice and 7224  
 7 without parental participation. I think this is a deplorable 7225  
 8 Bill, and I would urge, excuse me, a deplorable Amendment as 7226  
 9 the original Bill was, and I would urge 'no' on the motion to  
 10 concur. 7227

11 Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe to close." 7229

12 Jaffe: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's sort of funny that..." 7231

13 Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. 7232  
 14 Ryan." 7233

15 Ryan: "...Will the Gentleman yield, Mr. Speaker?" 7235

16 Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, Mr. Ryan?" 7237

17 Ryan: "Will the Gentleman yield?" 7239

18 Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will." 7241

19 Ryan: "Representative Jaffe, do you have any numbers of 12-year-old 7242  
 20 alcoholics in the State of Illinois?" 7244

21 Jaffe: "No, I don't, George." 7246

22 Ryan: "Pardon." 7248

23 Jaffe: "I don't have any figures, do you?" 7250

24 Ryan: "No, no I don't. I'm serious, I just wondered if you knew how 7251  
 25 many we had, whether there's a lot er, you have no idea?" 7253

26 Jaffe: "No, I don't." 7255

27 Ryan: "Well then, why did you introduce the Bill? I mean, I 7256  
 28 thought..." 7257

29 Jaffe: "Well, I think that if you're interested in children, you know 7258  
 30 I'm glad that you asked me that question. We've heard a lot of 7259  
 31 chest beating and a lot of other things on the floor of the 7260  
 32 House with regard to what happens to alcoholic kids. I would 7261  
 33 suggest to you the reason I introduced the Bill was I think 7262  
 34 that this is the only piece of legislation that really deals 7263  
 35 with alcoholism in a reasonable manner. I must tell you that  
 36 the Bill was also introduced by virtue of the Medical Society, 7264

1 which is very impressive in this Bill and which approves it, 7265  
2 but if you're going to deal with alcoholic kids, let me tell 7266  
3 you that we're not going to solve the problem by beating on 7267  
4 their chest and passing some phony piece of legislation that we 7268  
5 think is going to conform to our constituents wishes. What we  
6 ought to do is get those kids into treatment. And basically 7269  
7 what this Bill says is if you get those kids into treatment and 7270  
8 we can see that we talked on the floor and said that alcoholism 7271  
9 is really a family problem and you ought to get the family 7272  
10 involved. But initially, sometimes the family does not become  
11 involved, and so we say to the kid, okay, give us the treatment 7273  
12 and the Senate tightens up the thing and says alright they 7274  
13 ought to get into treatment and we're going to involve the 7275  
14 family by the time the second visit comes unless that 7276  
15 jeopardizes, you know that person's health or well-being. But  
16 in no event, do we let the treatment last more than three 7277  
17 months without the family being involved. I think if we want 7278  
18 to do something about alcohol with them, and we want to take 7279  
19 care of our kids and we want to be reasonable then you're going 7280  
20 to vote yes for this concurrence motion. I might tell you that  
21 the drug abuse statute does not have this provision, it is much 7281  
22 more open-ended, so if you're going to say drug abuse we 7282  
23 shouldn't...we don't have to call in the parents, but for 7283  
24 alcoholism you know, we do, which we're now saying, I think if 7284  
25 you're going to go reasonably you're going to follow this  
26 particular Amendment, and that's why I introduced it to the 7285  
27 Bill." 7286

28 Ryan: "Well, thank you, Erin, but your answer to the question is that 7287  
29 you don't know how many there are. Is that right?" 7289

30 Jaffe: "That was your first question..." 7291

31 Ryan: "I'd like to address the Bill." 7293

32 Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir." 7295

33 Ryan: "For some time for several years that I have been here, this is 7297  
34 the first good Bill that I've seen Representative Jaffe handle. 7298  
35 And I think that everything that he has pointed out is 7299  
36 absolutely right. Anybody that's an alcoholic at twelve years 7300

1 old either got that way with or without parental consent, but 7300  
 2 certainly with parental neglect. And I think that you're right 7301  
 3 on target here, and I'm going to support your Bill." 7303

4 Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Hannig." 7305

5 Hannig: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question." 7307

6 Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. 7308

7 All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. 7309

8 The previous question has been moved, the Gentleman from Cook, 7310

9 Mr. Jaffe to close." 7311

10 Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I think the Amendment has been well debated. 7312

11 Let me just say that, you know, the Department of...all the 7313

12 Departments of the State are for it, everyone that deals with 7314

13 alcoholic treatment, the Medical Society is for this Amendment, 7315

14 I think if we're going to do something good about alcoholism 7316

15 for minors in this session of the General Assembly, we ought to 7317

16 pass House Bill 882 and concur to the Amendment that came over 7318

17 from the Senate." 7319

18 Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is shall the House concur in Senate 7320

19 Amendment #1 to House Bill 882. All in favor vote 'aye', all 7321

20 opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines to 7322

21 explain his vote. The timer is on." 7323

22 Gaines: "Well, I just wanted to say amen to what ah, George Ryan said 7324

23 that I think it's a case where kids need a good start, because 7325

24 they usually got started on the wrong track around the parents, 7326

25 and sometimes they're too embarrassed to let the parents know 7327

26 they're involved until later. But he's got enough votes, so 7328

27 I'll quit." 7329

28 Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who 7330

29 wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 7331

30 there's a 120 'ayes' 41 'nays' 1 recorded as 'present', the 7332

31 House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 882. 7333

32 This Bill having received the constitutional majority is hereby 7334

33 declared passed. House Bill 905. Mr. McGrew? Take it out of 7335

34 the record. House Bill 909, Mr. Watson." 7336

35 Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move for 7337

36 nonconcurrence." 7338

1 Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur to 7339  
2 Senate Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 7340  
3 'aye', 'aye', opposed. The House does not concur with Senate 7341  
4 Amendment #1 to House Bill 909. Senate Bill...House Bill 925. 7342  
5 Mr. Skinner." 7343  
6 Skinner: "I move to nonconcur." 7345  
7 Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur to Senate Amendment 7346  
8 #1 to House Bill 925. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman 7347  
9 from Cook, Mr. Chapman." 7348  
10 Chapman: "If we could just, Mr. Speaker, have what the Sponsor is 7349  
11 nonconcurring in, maybe we don't agree with him." 7351  
12 Speaker Lechowicz: "As a matter of courtesy, it has always been the 7352  
13 case that the Sponsor votes to nonconcur, the House goes 7353  
14 along...um..." 7354  
15 Skinner: "I move to nonconcur with the rotten Senate Amendment." 7356  
16 Speaker Lechowicz: "All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. 7357  
17 The House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 7358  
18 925. House Bill 938. Mr. Yourell." 7360  
19 Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the 7361  
20 House, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 7362  
21 938. The Amendment shifts the financing of all local elections 7363  
22 except special elections in emergency referendum back to the 7364  
23 county or Municipal Board's Election Commissioners. Without 7365  
24 this change in the consolidated elections, the county would be  
25 reimbursed by each political subdivision for the cost of 7366  
26 conducting local elections which is a cumbersome way of doing 7367  
27 it and I move for to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to 938." 7369  
28 Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion, the Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen." 7370  
29 Pullen: "Will the Sponsor yield?" 7373  
30 Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will." 7375  
31 Pullen: "Does this Bill authorize the counties to levy a tax for 7376  
32 election costs?" 7377  
33 Yourell: "That's correct." 7379  
34 Pullen: "Have we already passed legislation that has the state pay 7380  
35 the cost of consolidated election?" 7382  
36 Yourell: "No." 7384

- 1 Pullen: "Boy, it sure sounded like it to me last week." 7388
- 2 Speaker Lechowicz: "The...any further discussion? The Gentleman from 7387
- 3 Cook, Mr. Yourell to close. Harry, your light was off over 7388
- 4 here. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber." 7390
- 5 Leinenweber: "Well, somebody must of shut it off, because I put on. 7391
- 6 I have a question for the Sponsor. The Bill left the House, it 7392
- 7 eliminated the power of downstate counties to seek referendum 7393
- 8 approval for additional property tax rate to pay election 7394
- 9 costs, and now as I understand it, the Bill has come back 180 7395
- 10 degrees that now extends the authority to raise the tax without
- 11 a referendum?" 7397
- 12 Yourell: "No, this Bill repeals the open in election tax 7398
- 13 authorization for political subdivision." 7400
- 14 Leinenweber: "Well, the Senate Amendment completely rewrites the 7401
- 15 Bill, and ah, reverses what the original intention of the Bill 7402
- 16 was, wasn't it?" 7403
- 17 Yourell: "No, current law authorizes counties under 3,000,000 to levy 7404
- 18 a tax to pay the cost of conducting elections. And this does 7405
- 19 not make that change at all." 7407
- 20 Leinenweber: "But the Bill originally repealed or removed that 7408
- 21 authority for counties under 3,000,000, right?" 7410
- 22 Yourell: "You're referring to 902, I think." 7412
- 23 Leinenweber: "938 must..." 7414
- 24 Yourell: "Well, 902 and 938 went out of the House. One had an 7415
- 25 open-ended levy and this one has a levy authorized by the 7416
- 26 counties." 7417
- 27 Leinenweber: "Well, I'm looking at the Legislative Digest, and it 7418
- 28 says the Bill amends the county's...authority to levy the tax 7419
- 29 to pay election expenses effective December 1, 1980. Senate 7420
- 30 Amendment #1, an Act in Relation to the Implementation of 7421
- 31 Consolidated Elections instead of repealing that provision 7422
- 32 provides that the counties of more than a million, there's 7423
- 33 authorization in levying, collect in odd-numbered years the tax 7424
- 34 not to exceed five hundredths of a percent of a value 7425
- 35 equalized, etc. And for less than a million, not to exceed 3%. 7425
- 36 It seems to me that if the Digest is anywhere near accurate, 7426

1 you're tak...started out by removing authority to levy a tax,  
2 now we're coming back and extending authority to levy a tax  
3 without a referendum."

4 Yourell: "No, this, what you're referring to is similar to another  
5 Bill that we passed out. This is somewhat similar but not the  
6 same. This is a Bill that was worked over by the Township  
7 Municipal League, the Township Clerk, the Municipal Clerk, and  
8 this is the Bill that they agreed to."

9 Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, briefly on the Bill, the Bill must  
10 be, I'm reading from the Digest and ah, it went out of the  
11 short debate calendar in the House, it did have some opposition  
12 on the floor apparently. That opposition in the Senate and now  
13 it's back here for concurrence on a totally new Act completely  
14 different and exactly 180 degrees from where it's left. And I  
15 don't think we should easily pass this Bill."

16 Yourell: "Well, Mr. Leinenweber, may I suggest to you that any change  
17 that was made in the original 938 that went out, was suggested  
18 by the Taxpayers Federation. This was a better approach, and  
19 this is what they agreed to."

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

21 Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I arise to oppose  
22 the effective Senate Amendment #1, especially in #5 there. It  
23 says Cook County is required to reimburse Chicago for its cost  
24 in holding general primaries and elections. And it also  
25 deletes the provision in the Election Consolidation Act  
26 requiring political subdivisions to reimburse counties and  
27 municipalities for elections' costs occurring in all but  
28 emergency referendums and special elections. Ah, this changes  
29 the entire effect of the Bill, and ah, I can't see how we can  
30 support anything like this."

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

32 Yourell: "Well, just counting what we're doing with 938, if you  
33 recall we had a cost sharing formula in a consolidated election  
34 Bill where all municipal corporations and all special  
35 districts would adjudge their cost on a prorata share judged by  
36 the precincts and the number of ballots, spaces on the ballots."

1 Now we're allowing the county to levy the tax, all of these 7464  
2 municipal corporations, all of the special districts will not  
3 levy a tax. This will be paid by the county." 7466  
4 Anonymous: "Who pays the taxes in Cook County?" 7468  
5 Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Frederick." 7470  
6 Yourell: "We pay the taxes in Cook County." 7472  
7 Frederick: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, my analysis says 7473  
8 this triples the tax the counties can levy for elections 7474  
9 without any referendum. Now I've been told repeatedly, and of 7475  
10 course I oppose the consolidation of elections, about how much 7476  
11 money we're going to save. Here's some more money you're going 7477  
12 to save now. I want you to make a note of it, because when you 7478  
13 get through I'm going to make a big list. We voted the other 7479  
14 day for the state to spend \$2,000,000 to pay to the counties. 7479  
15 That's some more of the savings, so keep a list of it, you'll 7480  
16 be surprised how much you didn't save when it's all over." 7482  
17 Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz." 7484  
18 Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield for two quick questions?" 7486  
19 Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will." 7488  
20 Leverenz: "The first question is does this allow Cook County then to 7489  
21 levy a tax to pay for these costs?" 7491  
22 Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Yourell, please." 7493  
23 Yourell: "Yes, in the odd year only." 7495  
24 Leverenz: "In the odd year only. Does that ah, encompass downstate 7496  
25 too?" 7497  
26 Yourell: "Downstate counties levy a tax as well." 7499  
27 Leverenz: "And if the analysis is correct, ah, it says such taxes are 7500  
28 without referendum and are in addition to any statutory rate 7501  
29 limit. Is that accurate?" 7502  
30 Yourell: "That's correct." 7504  
31 Leverenz: "Thank you." 7506  
32 Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh." 7508  
33 Walsh: "Ah, will the Gentleman yield?" 7510  
34 Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will." 7512  
35 Walsh: "Ah, the Republican staff analysis ah, refers to Cook County 7513  
36 reimbursing Chicago for its cost ah, and in addition makes a 7514

1 reference to Cook County being a home rule unit. Now are we 7515  
2 making a distinction here that is the purpose of this Bill or 7516  
3 this Senate Amendment so that the Cook County Board of Election 7517  
4 Commissioners can levy the necessary tax and is the effect of  
5 it to increase what they levy?" 7519

6 Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Yourell." 7521

7 Yourell: "Only in the even-numbered years, and that's already the 7522  
8 law." 7523

9 Walsh: "What is the, what is the point in talking about 7524  
10 Chicago...Cook County levying a .05% rate when they are 7525  
11 presently levying a .04% rate?" 7526

12 Yourell: "No, you're referring to DuPage County not Cook, Sir, and 7527  
13 this does not change that." 7529

14 Walsh: "That's, no, I'm referring...of course, we're looking at 7530  
15 different things, and we're at a bit of a disadvantage, I 7531  
16 guess. I'm looking at the Republican Staff Analysis, and 7532  
17 you're looking at something else. It would be, well, beyond 7533  
18 that, I'm satisfied frankly that, that in Cook County we're at  
19 the mercy of the County Board, because they can levy whatever 7534  
20 they want to, because of their home rule unit. So I don't, I 7535  
21 honestly don't see where it affects me as a Cook County 7536  
22 resident. However, I represent a bit of DuPage and ah, I'm a 7537  
23 little bit concerned that ah, DuPage can get a 100% increase in 7538  
24 their levy for the purpose of elections, and it seems to me 7539  
25 that ah, that is a little, a little out of line with what might 7540  
26 be expected from the consolidated Election Law. I might submit  
27 also, with respect to DuPage that assessments there are going 7541  
28 up at a staggering level, and the multiplier seems to be 7542  
29 keeping pace, so that the levy of, that they're currently 7543  
30 getting will yield considerably more money, and it would'nt 7544  
31 seem to me that it would be necessary there to provide for an  
32 increase at all." 7545

33 Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell to close." 7546

34 Yourell: "Listen, Walsh, that 4% that you're referring to, DuPage 7548  
35 County is already there in the law. They have the statutory 7549  
36 authority to levy up to 4% now, Sir." 7551



1 Walsh: "No." 7553

2 Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Yourell to close." 7555

3 Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 7556

4 House, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 938 is absolutely 7557

5 necessary if we're going to have a uniform application of the 7558

6 levy for the conduction of consolidated elections starting in 7559

7 December of 1980. What we're doing is eliminating the 7560

8 cumbersome ah, procedure by which units of local governments, 7561

9 special districts and so forth levy a tax to pay for the cost 7562

10 of an election. With this Bill, we're eliminating that, so 7563

11 that there will be no reimbursement program. The counties will 7564

12 pay for the cost of election. And I think this is an 7565

13 absolutely necessary if we're going to have consolidation of 7566

14 elections, and I move once again to concur with Senate 7567

15 Amendment #1 to House Bill 938." 7568

16 Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur with 7569

17 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 938. All in favor vote 7570

18 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have 7571

19 all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will 7572

20 take the record. On this question there are 97 'ayes', 48 7573

21 'nos', 6 recorded as 'present'. The House does concur in 7574

22 Senate Amendment #1, and House Bill 938 having received the 7575

23 constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 7576

24 948. Mr. Cullerton. Mr. Wonderful." 7577

25 Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 7578

26 House, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 7579

27 948. The Amendment provides for initiation of a violation of 7580

28 probation and the tone of the period of probation by the 7581

29 mailing of a written notice instead of by a verified petition. 7582

30 This mailing can be done by the Clerk of the Court or the 7583

31 Probation Department to the last known address. It also gives 7584

32 the court the right to order a summons or a warrant which is 7585

33 hard to have right now. I would ask for..." 7586

34 Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall 7587

35 the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 948. All 7588

36 in favor vote 'aye' all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who 7589

1 wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 7586  
2 record. On this question there's a 161 'ayes', 2 'nays', and 7587  
3 the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 7588  
4 948; this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is  
5 hereby declared passed. House Bill 953, Mr. Katz." 7590  
6 Katz: "Yes, I move to concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 953. 7591  
7 Amendment #1 added the phrase: vans, four-wheel drive vehicles 7592  
8 to House Bill 953. House Bill 953 was a Bill to ah, regulate, 7593  
9 to encourage the purchase of automobiles giving better gasoline 7594  
10 mileage. I would urge the adoption of Amendment #1." 7595  
11 Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Lady from Cook, 7596  
12 Miss Pullen." 7597  
13 Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question." 7599  
14 Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield." 7601  
15 Pullen: "You said that the Bill originally, and even with the 7602  
16 Amendment, encourages the use of automobiles that get better 7603  
17 gasoline mileage. Is it not true that it requires state 7604  
18 agencies, colleges and universities to purchase or lease 7605  
19 passenger automobiles confined with minimum gas mileage 7606  
20 standards rather than encourages?" 7607  
21 Katz: "Yes, it requires that the automobile purchase meet the mileage 7608  
22 standards that are provided under the Federal Law; however, 7609  
23 within the different vehicles that meets the mileage standards, 7610  
24 any such vehicle can be purchased." 7611  
25 Pullen: "Thank you." 7613  
26 Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk." 7615  
27 Polk: "Um, the Gentleman respond?" 7617  
28 Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield." 7619  
29 Polk: "Mr. Katz, yesterday when we discussed this, ah, it was my 7620  
30 understanding that it was your feeling that vans and emergency 7621  
31 vehicles, four-wheel vehicles should not be included in this." 7622  
32 Katz: "Yes, and that's what the Senate Amendment does. Mr. Polk, it 7624  
33 excludes them." 7625  
34 Polk: "But you had them in yesterday." 7627  
35 Katz: "That was a different Bill. That was a Senate Bill yesterday. 7628  
36 This is a House Bill." 7630

1 Polk: "Okay. Thank you." 7632

2 Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is shall the House concur with 7633

3 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 953. All in favor vote 7634

4 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have 7635

5 all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this 7636

6 question there's 119 'ayes', 40...120 'ayes', 42 'nays', 1 7637

7 recorded as 'present'. The House does concur in Senate 7638

8 Amendment #1 to House Bill 953. This Bill having received the 7639

9 Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the 7640

10 Calendar on page 12 are nonconcurrences. Senate Bill 7, Mr. 7641

11 Cullerton. Mr. Cullerton. Where did he go? Mr. Cullerton. 7642

12 Okay, take it out of the record. Senate Bill 17, Mr. Dawson. 7643

13 Page 12 of the calendar. The Gentleman moves that the House 7644

14 nonconcur in House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 17. Is there 7645

15 any discussion? Do you recede? Refuse to recede from 7646

16 Sen...Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 17. All in favor signify by 7647

17 saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed, the House refuses to recede, 7648

18 recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 17 and a Conference 7649

19 Committee is requested. Senate Bill 185, Mr. Davis. Jack 7650

20 Davis. Oh, he did that one? Senate Bill 188. Mr. 7651

21 Leinenweber. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 289, Mr. 7652

22 Getty. Out of the record. Pardon me. Okay. 486, Mr. Meyer." 7653

23 Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 7654

24 I would move that we refuse to recede from House Amendment #5 7655

25 and House Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 486 and a Conference 7656

26 Committee be appointed." 7657

27 Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? All in favor signify by 7658

28 saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. The Gentlemen refuse to recede 7659

29 from the Amendment and a Conference Committee is requested. 7660

30 505, Senate Bill 505, Mr. Polk. Out of the record. Senate 7661

31 Bill 528, Mr. Capparelli. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. 7662

32 Wolf, for what purpose do you seek recognition?" 7663

33 Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we can go back to House Bill 838 that 7664

34 was passed a few minutes ago." 7665

35 Speaker Lechowicz: "Soon as we get through with this one, Sir. There 7666

36 is a Bill that...Senate Bill 528, Mr. Capparelli, what do you 7667

1 want to do?" 7667

2 Capparelli: "I would like to recede from the Amendment and..." 7669

3 Speaker Lechowicz: "Ask for a Conference Committee?" 7671

4 Capparelli: "Ask for a Conference Committee, yes, Sir." 7673

5 Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman ref...the Gentleman moves to refuse 7674

6 to recede from the Amendment and requests a Conference 7675

7 Committee, all in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', 7676

8 opposed. The Gentleman's motion carries and the House refuses 7677

9 to recede from the Amendment. Now, ah, what was the Bill

10 number, Sam?" 7678

11 Wolf: "838." 7680

12 Speaker Lechowicz: "Senate Bill 838." 7682

13 Wolf: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Democratic 7683

14 Staff a few moments ago found a defect in Senate Amendment #1 7684

15 to House Bill 838. Having voted on the prevailing side, I 7685

16 would now move to reconsider the vote by which that Amendment 7686

17 was passed." 7687

18 Speaker Lechowicz: "On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. 7688

19 Schlickman." 7689

20 Schlickman: "Would the Gentleman yield?" 7691

21 Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will." 7693

22 Schlickman: "Could you describe the nature of the technical 7694

23 deficiency or defect?" 7695

24 Wolf: "Ah, yes, Representative Schlickman, the wrong lines were 7696

25 corrected, um, in the Amendment itself and rather than have the 7697

26 Bill be put in the posture of having to be vetoed by the 7698

27 Governor later on, it's thought best to correct it right now." 7699

28 Schlickman: "Thank you." 7702

29 Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is shall the House reconsider the 7703

30 vote by which the Amendment...by which the House concurred in 7704

31 the Amendment #1. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 7705

32 'no'." 7706

33 Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I would now move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment 7707

34 #1 to House Bill 838." 7709

35 Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the 7710

36 record. On this question there's 149 'aye', no 'nays', none 7711

1 recorded as 'present'. The House reconsiders the vote by which 7712  
 2 Amendment #1 the House concurs with Senate Bill 838. Now the 7713  
 3 Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Amendment #1. All in favor 7714  
 4 vote 'aye', say 'aye', opposed. The motion carries. Senate  
 5 Bill 559." 7715

6 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Molloy." 7717

7 Molloy: "I would move that the House recede from House Amendments 1, 7718  
 8 2 and 3. These areas can be addressed by the rules and 7719  
 9 regulations that are in Senate Bill 559, and the Director of 7720  
 10 the Department of Financial Institutions has authorized me to 7721  
 11 say that these matters will be handled better by rules and 7722  
 12 regulations. The Sponsor of these Amendments, Representative  
 13 Stuffle, agrees to this motion." 7724

14 Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on Representative 7725  
 15 Molloy's motion that the House recede from Amendments 1, 2 and 7726  
 16 3 to Senate Bill 559. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 7727  
 17 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted 7728  
 18 who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 7729  
 19 there's a 142...43 'aye', 2 'no', and the House does recede 7730  
 20 from Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 559. How about 563,  
 21 Yourell. Want that one? 563. The intention to quit about 7 7731  
 22 o'clock. We were going to go to 9 and Senator Geo-Karis paid a 7732  
 23 second visit. Representative Yourell." 7733

24 Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the 7734  
 25 House, I move to nonconcur in Senate Bill 563 and to recede 7735  
 26 from Senate Amendments #1 and 2, House Amendments." 7737

27 Speaker Redmond: "Tell Representative Slape not to use Representative 7738  
 28 Flinn's phone. What was your motion to recede, Representative 7739  
 29 yourell?" Yourell: "Can we take this out of the record?" 7741

30 Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 636, Reilly. Out of the 7742  
 31 record. Which one, he took it out of the record. 758. 758, 7743  
 32 Representative Schuneman. Out of the record. 769. 769. 7744  
 33 Peters. Out of the record. 807. Beatty. Out of the record. 7745  
 34 Agreed Resolutions. I'll be back, we're going back to page 6, 7746  
 35 Constitutional Amendments, Second Reading, and guess who it  
 36 is?" 7747

1 Clerk O'Brien: "House...Senate Joint Resolution 44, Peters; Senate 77  
 2 Joint Resolution 58, Capparelli-Conti-Giorgi; Senate Joint 77  
 3 Resolution 48, Jane Barnes; Senate Joint Resolution 62, Peters; 77  
 4 House Resolution 395, Johnson; 396, Johnson; 398, Yourell; 399, 77  
 5 Borchers; 400, Pechous; 401, J. David Jones; 403, Boucek; 404, 77  
 6 McBroom-Ryan; 405, Jaffe; 406, Stanley; 407, C. M. Steele." 77

7 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi." 77

8 Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, here's Senate Joint Resolution 44...asks the 77  
 9 Board of Education studies and funds. 58 by...'DiArco' by 77  
 10 Capparelli asks that June 24 through 30th be Juvenile Justice 77  
 11 and Delinquents Prevention Week. Senate Joint Resolution #48 77  
 12 by Jane Barnes proclaims a State of Illinois 'family' day of 77  
 13 fasting and prayer, Senate Joint Resolution #62 by Feters asks 77  
 14 that they...studies the existing Consumer Health Commission, 77  
 15 395 by Johnson notes a reception by President John Corbley, 77  
 16 396, by Johnson tells us about the 'Miller' Family singing 77  
 17 again, 398 by Yourell talks about...a benefit dinner and worth 77  
 18 in Illinois, 399. by Borchers tells about the Decatur 77  
 19 Sesquicentennial...Centennial Anniversary, 400 by Pechous asks 77  
 20 for the study of alternative fuels, 401 by Jones recognizes Mr. 77  
 21 Singer 30 years, 50 years of broadcasting, 403 by Boucek honors 77  
 22 his Father on his 90th birthday. 404 by McBroom-Ryan is a 77  
 23 Death Resolution, I think you ought to pull out it's a Death 77  
 24 Resolution. 405 by Jaffe requests the recording date of June 77  
 25 30th for the Rape Commission and Stanley's 406 tells about the 77  
 26 Youth Enrichment...services. I don't have 407." 77

27 Speaker Redmond: "Any..." 77

28 Giorgi: "Just a moment, Mr. Speaker. Is that Steele's? Honors the 77  
 29 Commander in Chief, William G. Moore. I move for the adoption 77  
 30 of the Agreed Resolutions, Mr. Speaker." 77

31 Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's 77  
 32 motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolution. Those in 77  
 33 favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the 77  
 34 motion carried, the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Further 77  
 35 Resolutions?" 77

36 Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 394, Johnson." 77

1 Speaker Redmond: "Read the further Resolutions. Committee on 7786  
 2 Assignments. Death Resolutions." 7788

3 Clerk O'Brien: "Death Resolution 389, Marovitz. The respect and 7789  
 4 memory of Harry Haidenborg. House Resolution 397, Roman 7790  
 5 Kosinski, respect the memory of Mr. Robert E. Kirkstone. House 7791  
 6 Resolution 404, McBroom-Ryan, respect the memory of Mr. Robert 7792  
 7 J. Sprinkle." 7793

8 Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi moves the adoption of the 7794  
 9 Death Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 7795  
 10 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. Death 7796  
 11 Resolutions adopted. It's been requested to call Senate Bill 7797  
 12 1325, Representative Frederick." 7798

13 Frederick: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I move that we refuse 7799  
 14 to recede on this Amendment #1 in the Senate and ask for a 7800  
 15 Conference Committee. Actually there was a poor staff report 7801  
 16 in the Senate, and the Senate agreed to the Amendment as 7802  
 17 originally done, but we have to have a Conference Committee." 7803

18 Speaker Redmond: "What was your motion, Representative Frederick?" 7805

19 Frederick: "That we refuse to recede and ask for a Conference 7806  
 20 Committee...there was an error in..." 7808

21 Speaker Redmond: "Gentlemen, any discussion on the...question's on 7809  
 22 the Gentleman's motion that the House refuse to recede from 7810  
 23 Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1325. Those in favor say 'aye', 7811  
 24 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried, 7812  
 25 and the House refuses to recede. On page 6, Constitutional 7813  
 26 Amendment, Second Reading. House Joint Resolution 7814  
 27 Constitutional Amendment #13." 7815

28 Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #13, 7816  
 29 resolve that the House of Representatives of the 81st General 7817  
 30 Assembly, the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein 7818  
 31 that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for 7819  
 32 adoption or rejection the General Election next occurring at 7820  
 33 least six months after the adoption of this Resolution. A 7821  
 34 proposition to add Section 11 to Article 9 of the Constitution 7822  
 35 to read as follows: Article 9, Section 11, limitation on total 7822  
 36 of state taxes on shares committed to local government and ad 7823

1 valorem personal property taxes, prohibition of mandate local 7824  
 2 programs without state funding, provisions for the transfer of 7825  
 3 programs. A) There is hereby established a limit of the taxes 7826  
 4 imposed by the General Assembly for any fiscal year. The State  
 5 shall not impose taxes of any kind which together with all 7827  
 6 other revenues of the State except revenues received from the 7828  
 7 Federal Government, revenues received by the State Revolving 7829  
 8 Funds, receipt from the sale of General Obligation Bonds and 7830  
 9 contributions to an earnings of Trust Funds in the custody of  
 10 the State Treasurer shall exceed 8% of the average annual 7831  
 11 personal income." 7832

12 Speaker Redmond: "We can read these on Second Reading on Perfunctory 7833  
 13 Session, so there's no sense in keeping all the Members here. 7834  
 14 Representative Giorgi." 7835

15 Giorgi: "Yes, Sir." 7837

16 Speaker Redmond: "10 o'clock tomorrow, perfunctory for the Clerk to 7838  
 17 read the Constitutional Amendments." 7840

18 Giorgi: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn til 10 o'clock 7841  
 19 tomorrow morning except for the minutes that the Clerk needs 7842  
 20 for the perfunctory session." 7843

21 Speaker Redmond: "What did you say, Mr. Clerk? Yea. Reading of the 7844  
 22 Constitutional Amendments, Second Reading and the messages from 7845  
 23 the Senate during the Perfunct. The question is on the 7846  
 24 Representative Giorgi's motion to adjourn 10 o'clock tomorrow. 7847  
 25 Those in favor of the motion indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye',  
 26 opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carries, the House, 7848  
 27 after the perfunctory session will stand adjourned til 10 7849  
 28 o'clock. You should be in at 9:45 though, because you got 15 7850  
 29 minutes grace tonight. No, no, 1332 and 42, you my as well 7851  
 30 read them off." 7852

31 Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 7853  
 32 Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of 7854  
 33 Representatives the Senate's concurred with the House adoption 7855  
 34 of the following Joint Resolutions: To Wit, House Joint 7857  
 35 Resolutions #22, 27, 34, 38, 53, and 54 concurred in by the  
 36 Senate June 24, 1979, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message 7858



1 from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I'm 7859  
2 directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has 7860  
3 concurred with the House in the passage of Bills with the 7861  
4 following title: DeWitt, House Bills #1286, 1289, 1291, 1293,  
5 1297, 1304, 1322, 1323, 1334, 1341, 1346, 1356, 1361, 1386, 7862  
6 1393, 1442, 1443, 1464 and 1469 passed by the Senate June 24, 7863  
7 1979, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Continuing the Second Reading 7864  
8 of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment  
9 #13. A) There is hereby established the limit on the taxes 7865  
10 imposed by the General Assembly for any fiscal year. The State 7866  
11 shall not impose taxes of any kind which together with all of 7867  
12 the revenues of the State, such revenues received from the 7868  
13 Federal Government, revenues received by the State Revolving  
14 Funds, receipts from the sale of General Obligation Bonds and 7869  
15 contributions to and earnings of Trust Funds in the custody of 7870  
16 the State Treasurer shall exceed 8% of the average annual 7871  
17 personal income of Illinois of the next, of the next to last 7872  
18 full calendar year proceeding the year in which the fiscal year 7873  
19 begins and the prior two calendar years. Personal income of 7874  
20 Illinois is the total income received by persons in Illinois  
21 from all sources including transfer payments as defined and 7875  
22 officially reported by the United States Department of Commerce 7876  
23 or its successor agency. No expenses of State Government shall 7877  
24 be incurred for any fiscal year which exceeds an amount the 7878  
25 revenue limit established by this Section. B) For any fiscal  
26 year in the event the total revenues of the State exceed the 7880  
27 revenue limit established in subsection A of this Section by 2% 7881  
28 or less, this excess shall be transferred as determined by the  
29 General Assembly to a Budget Stabilization Fund in the State 7882  
30 Treasury. The total amount maintained in the Budget 7883  
31 Stabilization Fund shall not exceed 2% of the revenue limit 7884  
32 established in subsection A of this Section. Revenues 7885  
33 allocated to the Budget Stabilization Fund in excess of the  
34 limit shall be available for redistribution as provided in 7886  
35 subsection C of this Section. Expenditures from the Budget 7887  
36 Stabilization Fund may be made only if all the following 7888

1 conditions are met: 1. the Governor requests the General 7889  
 2 Assembly to declare an emergency 2. the request is specific  
 3 as to the nature of the emergency and the dollar amount of the 7890  
 4 emergency and 3. the General Assembly thereafter declares an 7891  
 5 emergency in accordance with the Governor's request by a Joint 7892  
 6 Resolution adopted by a 3/5ths vote of the Members elected to 7893  
 7 each House. The Bill providing for the appropriation of funds 7894  
 8 for the emergency must be passed by a 3/5ths vote by the  
 9 Members elected to each House. Total revenues of the State 7895  
 10 means all public funds received by the State. It does not 7896  
 11 include revenues received from the Gen...Federal Government. 7897  
 12 Revenues received by the State's Revolving Fund beseech from 7898  
 13 the sale a General Obligation Bond of the contribution to and  
 14 the earnings of Trust Funds in the custody of the State 7899  
 15 Treasury. It is, if it is determined that the amount of the 7900  
 16 Budget Stabilization Fund is less than the amount needed to 7901  
 17 meet an emergency situation, taxes in excess of the limits  
 18 established in subsection A of this Section may be imposed and 7903  
 19 collected only if all the following conditions are  
 20 met: 1. the Governor requests the General Assembly to declare 7904  
 21 an emergency 2. the request is specific as to the nature of 7905  
 22 the emergency, the dollar amount of the emergency and the 7906  
 23 method by which the emergency will be funded and 3. upon 7907  
 24 receiving the request, the General Assembly declares an  
 25 emergency in accordance with its specifications of the 7908  
 26 Governor's request by a Joint Resolution adopted by a 2/3rds 7909  
 27 vote of the Members elected to each House. The Bills providing 7910  
 28 for the appropriation of funds for the emergency must be passed 7911  
 29 by a 2/3rds vote of the Members elected to each House. The  
 30 emergency must be declared in accordance with these procedures 7912  
 31 prior to incurring any of the expense which constitutes this 7913  
 32 specific emergency request. The revenue limitation may be 7914  
 33 exceeded only for the fiscal year in which the emergency is 7915  
 34 declared. In subsequent fiscal years, the revenue limit of 7916  
 35 subsection A of this Section shall again take effect. An  
 36 emergency shall not be declared in two successive of fiscal 7917

1 years without the approval of the majority of the qualified 7918  
2 electors of this State voting thereon. Income earned from the 7919  
3 funds maintained in the Budget Stabilization Fund shall occur 7920  
4 to the fund. At the end of each fiscal year, any balance of  
5 the Budget Stabilization Fund in excess of 2% required by this 7921  
6 subsection for the Budget Stabilization Fund for the succeeding 7922  
7 fiscal year shall be available for redistribution as provided 7924  
8 in subsection C of this Section. C) For any fiscal year in  
9 the event that total revenues of the State exceed the revenue 7925  
10 limit established in subsection A of this Section by more than 7927  
11 2% of the amount of the Budget Stabilization Fund exceeds the  
12 level established by subsection D of this Section or both, the 7928  
13 General Assembly shall provide for distribution of the excess 7929  
14 revenues in any of the following methods: 1. distribution to 7930  
15 the various State Pension Funds established by law in 7931  
16 proportion to the perspectives actuarial reserve deficiencies  
17 in the several funds based on the benefits in effect at the 7932  
18 time the effective date of this Section. Funds distributed 7933  
19 under this method shall be used only to reduce the actuarial 7934  
20 reserve deficiencies of the various State Pension 7935  
21 Funds. 2. distribution for the retirement of outstanding  
22 General Obligation Bonds of the State. Funds distributed under 7936  
23 this method shall not be used to pay current principle and 7937  
24 interest charges. They should only be used to retire 7938  
25 outstanding General Obligation Bonds and 3. distribution in  
26 the form of reduction or the rebate of state taxes. D) There 7939  
27 is hereby established the limit on the ad valorem taxes levied 7940  
28 on real property by units of local government and school 7941  
29 districts. Total yield resulting from the application of the 7942  
30 tax rate for any tax year to the assessed valuation of real 7943  
31 property as finally equalized for that year, including the  
32 value of new construction and improvements in property added by 7945  
33 annexation shall not be increased over the yield in the  
34 previous year in excess of 75% of the increases in the Consumer 7946  
35 Price Index. All items for the United States as defined and 7947  
36 reported by the Bureau of Labors' Statistics of the United 7948

1 States Department of Labor or its successor agency where the 7  
2 last full calendar year prior to the date the unit of local  
3 government or school district levied such taxes. If the total 7  
4 yield exceeds this limit, and the tax rate applied to the  
5 equalized assessed evaluation shall be reduced to produce a 7  
6 yield which reflects no more than the limit established by this 7  
7 subsection. The revised tax rates will then be applied to the 7  
8 equalized assessed evaluation of new construction and the 7  
9 improvements in property added by annexation. The limitation  
10 of this subsection shall not apply to taxes imposed for the 7  
11 payment of principle and interest on bonds or other evidence of 7  
12 indebtedness or for the payments of accessments on contract 7  
13 obligations and in anticipation of which bonds are issued which 7  
14 were authorized prior to the effective date of this Section. 7  
15 If the definition of the tax space is broadened, the tax rate  
16 of the new base in each unit of local government and school 7  
17 district shall be reduced provided the same total yield as the 7  
18 prior base. The limitations of this subsection shall apply to 7  
19 home rule units. However, the home rule unit may by a majority  
20 vote of the qualified electors of the home rule unit voting 7  
21 thereon determine that the provisions of this subsection shall 7  
22 not apply to their home rule unit. The home rule unit may 7  
23 subsequently determine that the provisions of this subsection 7  
24 shall apply by majority of the qualified electors of the home 7  
25 rule unit voting thereon. The state tax or the tax rate of the  
26 local, of the unit of local government or school district may 7  
27 be increased to yield revenue exceeding the limits established 7  
28 by this subsection only with the approval of the majority of 7  
29 the qualified electors of the unit of local government or 7  
30 school districts voting thereon. If such an increase is 7  
31 improved, then the total yield, including the new tax rate, 7  
32 shall be used to determine the limitation in its exceeding  
33 years. E) Whenever a law, whenever by law or by court order 7  
34 the responsibility for defraying the cost of a program is 7  
35 transferred from one unit of government to another unit of 7  
36 government, the total yield established by this Section for the

1 unit of Government to which such responsibility was transferred 7979  
 2 shall be commensurately increased and the total yield 7980  
 3 established by this Section for the unit of government from 7981  
 4 which such responsibility was transferred shall be 7982  
 5 commensurately decreased. F) The General Assembly shall by law  
 6 prescribe the manner by which any unit of local government or 7983  
 7 school district created after the effective date of this 7984  
 8 Section shall determine the limits established in subsection D 7985  
 9 or this Section during the first year of this existence. No 7986  
 10 new unit of local government or school district shall be 7987  
 11 created after the effective date of this Section, except by the  
 12 approval of the majority of the qualified electors of the 7988  
 13 proposed unit of local government or school district voting 7989  
 14 thereon. G) For any fiscal year a portion of the State 7990  
 15 expenditures paid to all units of local government and school 7991  
 16 districts shall not be reduced below the proportion paid to all  
 17 units of local government and school districts in Fiscal Year 7992  
 18 1980. H) The State shall appropriate funds for each unit of 7993  
 19 local government and school district to reimburse if for the 7994  
 20 full cost for mandates enacted after the effective date of this 7995  
 21 Section. However, where the General Assembly is required to 7996  
 22 enact legislation to comply with the federal mandate, the State 7997  
 23 shall be exempt from the requirement of reimbursing any unit of  
 24 local government or school district for the cost of the 7998  
 25 mandate. State mandates for which funds are not appropriated 7999  
 26 to reimburse units of local government and school districts are 8000  
 27 void until such time as required funds are appropriated. No 8001  
 28 unit of local government or state, or school district shall be  
 29 required to implement any mandate enacted after the effective 8002  
 30 date of this Section unless that mandate is the result of a 8003  
 31 federal or court mandate for funds which appropriated for the 8004  
 32 unit of local government or school district for the cost of the 8005  
 33 mandate is determined by the General Assembly. The limits 8006  
 34 established by subsection D of this Section shall not apply to  
 35 new or expanded federal or court mandates. I) Any tax imposed 8007  
 36 to replace the revenue lost due to the abolishment of personal 8008

1 property taxes under subsection C of Section 5 of Article 9 8009  
 2 shall not be state taxes for the purpose of this Section, and 8010  
 3 the proceeds of such taxes shall not be included in the  
 4 compensation under subsection D of this Section of the 8011  
 5 proportion of state expenditures distributed to the units of 8012  
 6 local government and school districts. J) The General 8013  
 7 Assembly shall provide by law the implementation of the  
 8 provisions of this Section. Schedule, if approved by the 8014  
 9 electors, this Amendment takes effect July 1, next occurring 8015  
 10 after its adoption. Second Reading of the Constitutional 8016  
 11 Amendment." 8017

12 Leone: "Amendment #1 to House Constitutional Amendment, House Joint 8018  
 13 Resolution Constitutional Amendment #13, Totten, amends House 8019  
 14 Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 13 by deleting lines 8020  
 15 11 through 34 on page 1 all of page 2 through 6 and lines 1 8021  
 16 through 8 on page 7 and inserting in lieu thereof the  
 17 following: Article 9, Section 11, limitations on total of state 8022  
 18 taxes on the share committed to local governments and on ad 8023  
 19 valorem property tax prohibition of mandate of local programs 8024  
 20 without state funding provisions for the transfer of programs. 8025  
 21 There is hereby established a limit on taxes imposed by the 8026  
 22 General Assembly for any fiscal year. The State shall not  
 23 impose taxes on any kind which together with all other revenues 8027  
 24 of the State except revenues received from Federal Government, 8028  
 25 revenues received by State Revolving Funds, receipts of sale or 8029  
 26 General Obligation Bonds, and contributions to an earnings of  
 27 Trust Funds in the custody of the State Treasury shall exceed 8030  
 28 8% of the average annual personal income of Illinois of the 8031  
 29 next to last full calendar year preceding the calendar year in 8032  
 30 which the fiscal year begins and prior to two calendar years. 8033  
 31 Personal income of Illinois is for total income received by 8034  
 32 persons in Illinois from all sources, including transfer 8035  
 33 payments as defined and officially recorded by the United  
 34 States Department of Commerce or its successor agency. No 8036  
 35 expenses of State Government shall be incurred for any fiscal 8037  
 36 year which exceeds an amount the revenue limit established by 8038

1 this Section. For any fiscal year in the event that total 8039  
2 revenues of the State exceed the revenues limit established in  
3 subsection A of this Section, this excess shall be transferred 8040  
4 to the Budget Stabilization Fund of the State Treasury. 8041  
5 Emergency expenditures from the Budget Stabilization Fund may 8042  
6 be made only if all the following conditions are met: the  
7 Governor requests the General Assembly declare an emergency, a 8043  
8 request is specific as to the nature of the emergency and the 8044  
9 dollar amount of the emergency, and the General Assembly 8045  
10 thereafter declares an emergency in accordance with the 8046  
11 Governor's request by a Joint Resolution adopted by 3/5ths vote 8047  
12 of Members elected to each House. The Bill providing for the  
13 appropriation of funds for the emergency must be passed by 8048  
14 3/5ths vote of the Members elected to each House. Total 8049  
15 revenues of the State means all public funds received by the 8050  
16 State but that does not include Federal Aid received to the 8051  
17 State, Revolving Funds nor contributions to and earnings of 8052  
18 Trust Funds in the custody of the State Treasurer. If it is  
19 determined that the amount of the Budget Stabilization Fund is 8053  
20 less than the amount needed to meet an emergency situation, 8054  
21 taxes in excess of the limit established in subsection A of 8055  
22 this Section may be imposed and corrected only if all the  
23 following conditions are met: the Governor requests the 8056  
24 General Assembly declare an emergency 2. the request is 8057  
25 specific as to the nature of the emergency, the dollar amount 8058  
26 of the emergency and the method by which the emergency will be 8059  
27 funded and 3. upon receiving the request of the General  
28 Assembly declares an emergency in accordance with the 8060  
29 specifications of the Governor's request by a Joint Resolution 8061  
30 adopted by 2/3rds of the vote of the Members elected to each 8062  
31 House. The Bill providing for appropriations of funds for 8063  
32 emergencies must be passed by 2/3rds of the Members elected to  
33 each House. An emergency must be declared in accordance with 8064  
34 these procedures prior to the occurring of any of the expenses 8066  
35 which constitutes a specific emergency request. The revenue 8067  
36 limitations may be exceeded only for fiscal year in which the

1 emergency is declared. Any subsequent fiscal years the 8068  
 2 revenue limit of subsection A of this Section shall again take 8069  
 3 effect. Income earned from funds maintained in the Budget 8070  
 4 Stabilization Fund shall accrue to the fund for any fiscal year 8071  
 5 in the event that the amount in the Budget Stabilization Fund  
 6 exceeds 2% of the revenue limit established by subsection A of 8072  
 7 this Section. The General Assembly shall provide for 8073  
 8 distribution of the excess revenue in any of the following 8074  
 9 three methods: distribution to the various state pension funds 8075  
 10 established by law and proportioned to the respective actuarial  
 11 reserve deficits deficiencies of the several funds based on the 8076  
 12 benefit in effect at the time of the effective date of this 8077  
 13 Section. Sections...Funds distributed under this method shall 8078  
 14 be used only to reduce the actuarial reserve deficiencies of 8079  
 15 the various state pension funds. Distribution for the 8080  
 16 retirement of outstanding General Obligation Bonds of the  
 17 State, funds distributed under the method not to be used to pay 8081  
 18 concurrent principle and interest charges, but shall be only 8082  
 19 used to retire outstanding General Obligation Bonds, 8083  
 20 and 3. Distribution in the form of reducing or rebating the  
 21 state taxes. D There is thereby established a limit on the ad 8084  
 22 valorem taxes levied on real property by the units of local 8085  
 23 government and school districts. The total yield resulting 8086  
 24 from the application of tax rate for any tax year to the 8087  
 25 assessed valuation of real property as finally equalized for  
 26 that year, excluding the value of new construction and 8088  
 27 improvements of property added to annexation, shall not be 8089  
 28 increased over the yield in the previous year in excess of 50% 8090  
 29 of the increase in the Consumer Price Index. All items for the 8091  
 30 United States as defined or reported by the Bureau of Labor  
 31 Statistics of the United States Department of Labor or its 8092  
 32 successor agency for the last full calendar year prior to the 8093  
 33 date the unit of local government or school district levy such 8094  
 34 taxes. If the total yield exceeds this limit, the tax rate 8095  
 35 applied to the equalized accessed evaluation shall be reduced  
 36 to produce a yield which reflects no more than the limit 8096



1 established by this subsection. The revised tax rate shall 8097  
2 then be applied to the equalized assessed valuation, the new 8098  
3 construction and improvements in property added by annexation. 8099  
4 The limitation of this subsection shall not apply to the taxes 8100  
5 imposed for the payment of principle and interest on the bonds  
6 and entered evidence of indebtedness or for payments in excess 8101  
7 on contract obligations in anticipation of which bonds are 8103  
8 authorized prior to the effective date of this subsection. The  
9 limitations of this subsection shall apply to the home rule 8104  
10 unit; however, the home rule unit by a majority vote of the 8105  
11 qualified electors of the home rule unit voting thereon, 8106  
12 determine that the provisions of this subsection shall not  
13 apply to their home rule unit. The home rule unit by, may 8107  
14 subsequently determine that the provisions of this subsection 8108  
15 shall apply to the majority of the qualified electors of the 8109  
16 home rule unit voting thereon. The tax rate of the local unit 8110  
17 of government or school district may be increased to yield 8111  
18 revenue exceeding the limits established by this subsection  
19 only with the approval of the majority of the qualified 8112  
20 electors of the units of local government or school districts 8113  
21 voting thereon. If such an increase is approved and the total 8114  
22 yield including the new tax rate shall be used to determine the 8115  
23 limitations in the succeeding year. Whenever the law or by the  
24 court order the responsibility of defraying the cost of the 8116  
25 program is transferred from one unit of local government to 8117  
26 another unit of local government, the total yield established 8118  
27 by this Section for the unit of local government to which the, 8119  
28 such responsibility was transferred shall be commensurately 8120  
29 increased and the total yield established by this subsection,  
30 by this Section for the unit of local government from which 8121  
31 such responsibility has transferred shall be...this Section for 8122  
32 the unit of local government for which such responsibility has 8123  
33 transferred shall be commensurately decreased. The General 8124  
34 Assembly shall by law prescribe the manner for which the unit  
35 of local government or school district traded after the 8125  
36 effective date of this Section, shall determine the limits 8127

1 established by subsection D of this Section during the first 8128  
2 year of its existence. No new unit of local government or  
3 school district shall be created after the effective date of 8129  
4 this Section except by approval of the majority of the 8130  
5 qualified electors of the proposed unit of local government or 8131  
6 school districts voting thereon. For any fiscal year that 8132  
7 proportion of the state expenditures paid to all units of local  
8 government or school districts shall not be reduced below the 8133  
9 proportion paid to all units of local government or school 8134  
10 districts of fiscal year 1980. The State shall appropriate 8135  
11 funds for each unit of local government and school district to 8136  
12 reimburse it for the full cost for mandates enacted after the 8137  
13 effective date of this Section. However, where the General  
14 Assembly is required to enact legislation to comply with the 8138  
15 federal mandate, the State shall be exempt from the requirement 8139  
16 of reimbursing the unit of local government or school district 8140  
17 for the cost of the mandate. State mandates for which funds 8141  
18 are not appropriated to reimburse units of local government and 8142  
19 school districts are void until such time as they require funds 8143  
20 appropriated. No unit of local government or school district 8144  
21 shall be required to implement any mandate enacted after the 8145  
22 effective date of this Section unless the mandate is the result  
23 of the federal or court mandate of funds that are appropriated 8146  
24 for the unit of local government or school district for the 8147  
25 cost of the mandate as determined by the General Assembly. The 8148  
26 Amendment established by subsection D of this Section shall not 8149  
27 apply to the new or expanded federal or court mandates. Any 8150  
28 taxes imposed to replace the revenue lost due to the 8151  
29 abolishment of personal property taxes under subsection C of 8152  
30 Section 5 of Article 9 shall not be taxed, state taxes for the  
31 purpose of this Section and the proceeds of such taxes shall 8153  
32 not be included in the compensation under subsection G of this 8154  
33 Section of the proportion of state expenditures distributed to 8155  
34 units of local government and school districts. The General 8156  
35 Assembly shall provide by law for the implementation of the 8157  
36 provisions of this Section. Amendment #2, Mahar, amends House

1 Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 13 on page 5 by 8158  
 2 deleting lines 11 through 17 and inserting in lieu thereof: 8159  
 3 rule units..." 8160

4 Aikman: "Amendment to House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 8161  
 5 13 by Totten. Amendment #3 amends House Joint Resolution 8162  
 6 Constitutional Amendment 13 by deleting lines 10 through 34 on 8163  
 7 page 1 and all of pages 2 through 7 and inserting in lieu 8164  
 8 thereof the following: Article 9, Section 11, limitations on 8165  
 9 total of state taxes on the share committed to local  
 10 governments on ad valorem property taxes prohibited, 8166  
 11 prohibition of mandate of local programs without state funding, 8167  
 12 provisions for the transfer of programs. A There is hereby 8168  
 13 established a limit on the taxes imposed by the General  
 14 Assembly for any fiscal years. The State shall not impose 8169  
 15 taxes on any kind...of any kind which together with all of the 8170  
 16 revenues of the State, except revenues received from the 8171  
 17 Federal Government, revenues received by the State Revolving 8172  
 18 Fund, receipts from the sale of General Obligation Bonds and  
 19 contributions to and earnings of Trust Funds in the custody of 8173  
 20 the State Treasurer shall exceed 8% of the average annual 8174  
 21 personal income of Illinois and on the next to last full 8175  
 22 calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the fiscal  
 23 year begins and the prior two calendar years. Personal income 8176  
 24 of Illinois is the total income received by persons in Illinois 8177  
 25 from all sources including transfer payments as defined and 8179  
 26 officially reported by the United States Department of Commerce  
 27 or its successor agency. No expenses of State Government shall 8180  
 28 be incurred for any fiscal year which exceeds the amount the 8181  
 29 revenue limit established by this Section. B For any fiscal 8182  
 30 year in the event that total revenues of the State exceed the  
 31 revenue limit established in subsection A of this Section, this 8183  
 32 excess shall be transferred to a Budget Stabilization Fund in 8184  
 33 the State's Treasury. Emergency expenditures from the Budget 8185  
 34 Stabilization Fund may be made only if all the following 8186  
 35 conditions are met: 1. the Government requests the General 8187  
 36 Assembly to declare an emergency 2. the request is specific

1 as to the nature of the emergency and the dollar amount of the 8188  
 2 emergency, and 3. the General Assembly thereafter declared an 8189  
 3 emergency in accordance with the Governor's requests by a Joint 8190  
 4 Resolution adopted by 3/5ths vote of the Members elected to 8191  
 5 each House. The Bill providing for the appropriation of funds 8192  
 6 for the emergency must be passed by 3/5ths vote of the Members 8193  
 7 elected by each House. Total revenues of the State mean, means 8194  
 8 all public funds received by the State but does not include 8194  
 9 revenues received from the Federal Government. Revenues 8195  
 10 received by the State's Revolving Fund, receipts from the sale 8196  
 11 of the General Obligation Bonds or nor the contributions to the 8197  
 12 earnings of trust funds in the custody of the State Treasurer.  
 13 If it is determined that the amount in the Budget Stabilization 8198  
 14 Fund is less than the amount than needed on an emergency 8199  
 15 situation passes in excess of the limits established in 8200  
 16 subsection A of this Section may be imposed and collected only 8201  
 17 if all of the following conditions are met: 1. the Governor  
 18 requests the General Assembly to declare an emergency 2. the 8202  
 19 request is specific as to the nature of the emergency, the 8203  
 20 dollar amount of the emergency and the method by which the 8204  
 21 emergency will be funded, and 3. upon receiving the request 8205  
 22 the General Assembly declares an emergency in accordance with 8206  
 23 the solicitations of the Governor's request by a Joint 8207  
 24 Resolution adopted by a 2/3rds vote of the Members elected to  
 25 each House. The Bills providing for the appropriation of funds 8208  
 26 for the emergency must be passed by 2/3rds vote of the Members 8209  
 27 elected by each House. The emergency must be declared in 8210  
 28 accordance with these procedures prior to incurring and of the 8211  
 29 expense which contributes to the specific emergency request, 8212  
 30 constitutes a specific emergency request. The revenue  
 31 limitation may be exceeded only for the fiscal year in which 8213  
 32 the emergency is declared and subsequent fiscal years the 8214  
 33 revenues limit of subsection A or of this Section shall make, 8215  
 34 take effect, an emergency shall not be declared as, in two 8216  
 35 successive fiscal years without the approval of the...qualified  
 36 electors of the State voting thereon. Income earned from the 8217

1 funds maintained in the Budget Stabilization Fund shall accrue 8218  
 2 to the fund. C For any fiscal year in the event that the 8219  
 3 amount in the Budget Stabilization Fund exceeds 2% of the 8220  
 4 revenue limit established by subsection A of this Section, the  
 5 General Assembly shall provide for distribution of the excess 8221  
 6 revenues in any of the following three 8222  
 7 methods: 1. distribution to the various state's pension funds 8223  
 8 established by law in proportion to the respective actuarial 8224  
 9 reserve deficiency of the several funds based on the benefits  
 10 effected at the time of the effective date of this Section. 8225  
 11 Funds distributed under this method shall be used only to 8226  
 12 reduce the actuarial reserve deficiencies of ah, various state 8227  
 13 pension funds. 2. distribution for the retirement of 8228  
 14 outstanding General Obligation funds of the State. Funds 8229  
 15 distributed under this method shall not be used in any current  
 16 principle or interest charges, but shall only be used to retire 8230  
 17 outstanding General Obligations Bonds. (I don't read too good 8231  
 18 on this thing) Distributions to the force of the reduce of 8232  
 19 the, restudying the state taxes. D There is hereby 8233  
 20 established a limit to the no (sic) valorem taxes levied on  
 21 child, property or by units of local government and school 8234  
 22 districts. The total valid recruiting from the obligations of 8235  
 23 the tax rate for any tax year to the accessed valuation of real 8236  
 24 property as finely equalized for that year, excluding the value 8237  
 25 of new construction and improvements in, of property added 8238  
 26 by...shall not as...(yea, go ahead)." 8239

27 Leone: "shall not be increased over the yield in the previous year in 8240  
 28 excess of 75% of the increase the Consumer Price Index, all 8241  
 29 items of the United States as defined and recorded by the 8242  
 30 Bureau of Labor Statistics in the United States Department of 8243  
 31 Labor and its successor or its successor agency, for the last 8244  
 32 full calendar year of the date of the unit of local government  
 33 or school district levy such taxes. If the total yield exceeds 8245  
 34 this limit and the tax rate applied to the equalized accessed 8246  
 35 valuation shall not be reduced to produce a yield which 8247  
 36 reflects no more than the limit established by this subsection. 8248

1 The revised tax rate shall not then be applied to the equalized 8249  
2 accessed evaluation of the new construction and improvements to  
3 property added by annexation. The limitations of this 8250  
4 subsection shall not apply to taxes imposed for the payment of 8251  
5 principle and interest on bonds and other evidence of 8252  
6 indebtedness for the payments of this accessments and contract 8253  
7 obligations and anticipation of which bonds were issued which 8254  
8 were authorized prior to the effective date of this Section. 8255  
9 The limitations of this subsection shall apply to home rule  
10 units; however, the home rule unit may by majority vote of the 8256  
11 qualified electors of the home rule unit voting thereon 8257  
12 determine that the provisions of this subsection shall not 8258  
13 apply to their home rule unit. The home rule unit may  
14 subsequently determine that the provisions of this subsection 8259  
15 shall apply by the majority of the qualified electors to the 8260  
16 home rule unit voting thereon. The tax rate of a unit of local 8261  
17 government or school district may be increased to yield revenue 8262  
18 exceeding the limits established by this subsection only with  
19 the approval of the majority of the qualified electors of the 8263  
20 unit of local government or school district voting thereon. If 8264  
21 such an increase is approved, then the total yield including 8265  
22 the new tax rate, shall be used to determine the limitations in 8266  
23 this preceding year. Whenever by law or by court order the 8267  
24 responsibility for defraying the cost of this program is  
25 transferred from one unit of local government to another unit 8268  
26 of local government, the total yield established by this 8269  
27 Section for the unit of local government to which such 8270  
28 responsibility was transferred shall be commensurately increased  
29 and the total yield established by this subsection for the unit 8271  
30 of local government from which such responsibility was 8272  
31 transferred shall be commensurately decreased. The General 8273  
32 Assembly shall by law prescribe the manner of which any unit of 8274  
33 local government or school district created after the effective 8275  
34 date of this Section shall determine the limits established in 8276  
35 subsection D of this Section during the first year of its 8277  
36 existence. No new unit of local government or school district 8278

1 shall be created after the effective date of this Section 8278  
 2 except by the approval of the majority of the qualified 8279  
 3 electors that the proposed unit of local government or school 8280  
 4 district voting thereon. For any fiscal year that proportion 8281  
 5 of the state expenditures paid to all units of local government 8282  
 6 and school districts shall not be reduced for the proportion 8283  
 7 paid til all units of local government or school districts in  
 8 fiscal year 1980. The State shall appropriate funds for each 8284  
 9 unit of local government and school districts to reimburse it 8285  
 10 for the full cost of mandates enacted after the effective date 8286  
 11 of this Section. However, where the General Assembly is 8287  
 12 required to enact legislation to comply with the federal  
 13 mandate, the State shall be exempt from the requirement of 8288  
 14 reimbursing the unit of local government or school districts 8289  
 15 for the cost of the mandate. The state mandates for which 8290  
 16 funds are not appropriated to reimburse the units of local  
 17 government or school districts avoid until such time as the 8291  
 18 required funds are appropriated. No unit of local government 8292  
 19 or school district shall be required to implement any mandate 8293  
 20 enacted after the effective date of this Section unless the 8294  
 21 mandate is the result of federal or court mandate of funds are  
 22 appropriated for the unit of local government and school 8295  
 23 districts for the cost of the mandate as determined by the 8296  
 24 General Assembly. The limits established by subsection D of 8297  
 25 this Section shall not apply to new and expanded federal and 8298  
 26 court mandates. Any taxes imposed to replace the revenues lost 8299  
 27 to the abolishment of personal property taxes under subsection 8300  
 28 C of Section 5 of Article 9 shall be, shall not be state taxes 8301  
 29 for the purpose of this Section and the proceeds of such taxes  
 30 shall not be included in the computation under the subsection G 8302  
 31 of this Section for the proportionate state expenditures 8303  
 32 prescribed by the unit of local government and school 8305  
 33 districts. The General Assembly shall provide by law for the  
 34 implementation the provision of this Section. Schedule, if 8306  
 35 approved by the electors, this Amendment takes effect July 1st, 8307  
 36 next occurring after its adoption. Amendment #4, Mahar, amends 8308

1 House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 13 as amended 8309  
2 by House Amendment 2 with reference with the page and line 8310  
3 numbers of that Amendment on page 5 by deleting lines 1 through  
4 7 and inserting in lieu thereof: rule units. Amendment #5, 8311  
5 Mahar, amends House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 8312  
6 13 as amended in the first sentence of the third paragraph of 8313  
7 subsection D of Section 11 by inserting a period after home 8314  
8 rule units the first time it appears in the sentence and by 8315  
9 deleting the remainder of the third paragraph of subsection D  
10 of Section 11 beginning: however, a home rule unit may. House 8316  
11 Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 32, whereas the 8317  
12 Constitution of the United States guarantees the right of life 8318  
13 and this right of life should be proclaimed to exist from the 8319  
14 moment of conception or fertilization, and whereas the 8320  
15 Constitution of the United States provides that upon  
16 application by the Legislature 2/3rds of the states, the United 8321  
17 States Congress shall call Constitutional Conventions for 8322  
18 imposing Constitutional Amendments, and whereas millions of 8323  
19 abortions have been performed in the United States since the 8324  
20 abortion decision of the Supreme Court January 22, 1973, and  
21 whereas Congress of the United States has to date not proposed 8325  
22 subject to ratification, a human rights Amendment to the 8326  
23 Constitution of the United States. Therefore be it resolved by 8327  
24 the House of Representatives of the 81st General Assembly in 8328  
25 the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein that the  
26 General Assembly presented to the authority of Article 5 of the 8329  
27 Constitution of the United States, make applications to 8330  
28 Congress of the United States for calling for a convention for 8331  
29 an opposing Amendment to the Constitution of the United States 8332  
30 revised that every human being subject to the jurisdiction of 8333  
31 the United States or any state shall be deemed to be a person  
32 from the moment of conception or fertilization and an act to 8334  
33 the right of life guaranteed to the United States Constitution 8335  
34 provided that Congress and the several states shall have 8336  
35 concurred power to enforce such Amendment by appropriate 8337  
36 legislation, and be if further resolved that the Constitutional



1 Convention applied for herein shall be held for the sole 8338  
 2 purpose of considering the Constitutional Amendment prescribed 8339  
 3 in this Resolution, and that the application in Congress made 8340  
 4 by this Resolution is contingent upon the establishment by 8341  
 5 Congress within two years after the time 2/3rds of the states  
 6 have made application to this issue. And prior to the 8342  
 7 convening of such Convention the moves and procedures of such 8343  
 8 unlimited Convention, and be it further resolved that copies of 8345  
 9 this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate  
 10 of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United 8346  
 11 States, the Speaker of the House of the United States, the 8347  
 12 Clerk of the House of the United States and to each Member of 8348  
 13 Congress from this date and to the presiding officers of each 8349  
 14 House of the various state Legislatures requesting that several 8350  
 15 states to also pass an identical application to the United  
 16 States Congress so as to meet the Constitutional requirements 8351  
 17 for application for such a Convention by 2/3rds of the states. 8352  
 18 Second Reading of this Constitutional Amendment. House Joint 8353  
 19 Resolution Constitutional Amendment 42 resolved by the House of 8354  
 20 Representatives of the 81st General Assembly in the State of 8355  
 21 Illinois, the Senate concurring herein that there shall be  
 22 submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or 8356  
 23 rejection at the General Election next occurring at least six 8357  
 24 months after the adoption of this Resolution. A proposition to 8358  
 25 amend Section 12 of Article 6 of the Constitution to read as 8359  
 26 follows: the Judiciary. Election and retention, Supreme, 8360  
 27 Appellate and Circuit Judges shall be nominated at primary 8361  
 28 elections or by petition. Judges shall be elected at the 8362  
 29 General and Judicial Elections as the General Assembly may 8362  
 30 provide by law. A persons eligible for the office of Judge may 8363  
 31 cause his name to appear on the ballot as a candidate for Judge 8364  
 32 at the Primary or the General or Judicial Elections by 8365  
 33 submitting petitions. The General Assembly shall prescribe by  
 34 law the requirements for the petition. The office of Judge 8366  
 35 shall be vacant upon his death, resignation, retirement, 8367  
 36 removal or upon the conclusion of his term without retention in 8368

1 office. Whenever an additional Appellate or Circuit Judge is 8369  
 2 authorized by law, the office shall be filled in a manner 8370  
 3 provided by filling a vacancy in that office. The vacancy 8371  
 4 occurring in the office of Supreme, Appellate and Circuit Judge 8372  
 5 shall be filled as the General Assembly may provide by law. In 8373  
 6 the absence of law, vacancies may be filled by appointment by  
 7 the Supreme Court. A person appointed to fill a vacancy sixty 8374  
 8 or more days after the next primary election to nominate judges 8375  
 9 shall serve until the vacancy is filled for a term at the next 8376  
 10 General or Judicial Election. A person appointed to fill the 8377  
 11 vacancy less than sixty days prior to the next Primary Election 8378  
 12 to nominate Judges shall serve until the vacancy is filled at 8379  
 13 the second General and Judicial Election following such  
 14 appointment. Not less than six months before the General 8380  
 15 Election preceding the expiration of the term of office, the 8381  
 16 Supreme, Appellate and Circuit Judge has been elected to that 8382  
 17 office may file in the office of Secretary of State a  
 18 declaration of candidacy to succeed himself. The Secretary of 8383  
 19 State not less than thirty...sixty-three days before the 8384  
 20 election shall certify the judges candidacy to the proper 8385  
 21 election officials. The names of judges seeking retention  
 22 shall be submitted to the electors separately and without party 8386  
 23 designation and the sole question of whether each judge shall 8387  
 24 be retained in office for another term. The retention election 8388  
 25 shall be conducted at General Elections in the appropriate 8389  
 26 judicial districts for the Supreme, Appellate Judges and in the  
 27 county of residence per Circuit Judges. The affirmative vote 8390  
 28 of 3/5ths of the electors voting in the question shall be 8392  
 29 elected...elect the Judge to the office for a term commencing  
 30 the first Monday in December following his election. The law 8393  
 31 reducing the number of Appellate and Circuit Judges shall be 8394  
 32 without prejudice to the right of judges effected to seek 8395  
 33 retention in office. A reduction shall become effective when a 8396  
 34 vacancy occurs in these effective units. Schedule, this 8397  
 35 Amendment to Section 12 of Article 6 takes effect upon the  
 36 approval of the electors of this State. Second Reading of this 8398

1 Constitutional Amendment. Being no further business, the House 8399  
2 now stands adjourned."

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
JUNE 25, 1979

HB-0014	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	125
HB-0112	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	116
HB-0142	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	119
HB-0160	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	119
HB-0163	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	120
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	191
HB-0211	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	121
HB-0218	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	122
HB-0318	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	3
HB-0420	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	123
HB-0455	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	124
HB-0456	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	124
HB-0493	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	125
HB-0522	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	125
HB-0604	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	128
HB-0608	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	23
HB-0666	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	183
HB-0676	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	184
HB-0681	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	22
HB-0692	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	184
HB-0724	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	7
HB-0838	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	189
	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	204
	MOTIONS	PAGE	204
HB-0851	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	189
HB-0882	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	191
HB-0905	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	195
HB-0925	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	196
HB-0938	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	196
HB-0948	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	201
HB-0953	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	202
HB-0969	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	6
HB-0987	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	2
HB-1088	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	5
HB-1094	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	4
HB-1400	3RD READING	PAGE	102
HB-1541	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	7
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	10
	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	29
SB-0017	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	203
SB-0080	3RD READING	PAGE	97
SB-0101	2ND READING	PAGE	103
SB-0154	3RD READING	PAGE	99

## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
JUNE 25, 1979

PAGE 2

SB-0185	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	14
SB-0257	3RD READING	PAGE	30
SB-0263	3RD READING	PAGE	17
SB-0418	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	2
SB-0486	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	203
SB-0501	3RD READING	PAGE	30
SB-0528	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	204
SB-0559	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	205
SB-0565	3RD READING	PAGE	17
SB-0574	3RD READING	PAGE	36
SB-0587	2ND READING	PAGE	113
SB-0659	3RD READING	PAGE	54
SB-0751	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	185
SB-0918	3RD READING	PAGE	55
SB-1037	3RD READING	PAGE	56
SB-1038	3RD READING	PAGE	18
SB-1172	2ND READING	PAGE	96
	MOTIONS	PAGE	96
SB-1227	3RD READING	PAGE	61
SB-1325	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	207
SB-1331	2ND READING	PAGE	128
SB-1377	3RD READING	PAGE	76
HR-0389	3RD READING	PAGE	207
HR-0394	3RD READING	PAGE	206
HR-0395	3RD READING	PAGE	206
HR-0396	3RD READING	PAGE	206
HR-0397	3RD READING	PAGE	207
HR-0398	3RD READING	PAGE	206
HR-0399	3RD READING	PAGE	206
HR-0400	3RD READING	PAGE	206
HR-0401	3RD READING	PAGE	206
HR-0402	3RD READING	PAGE	72
HR-0403	3RD READING	PAGE	206
HR-0404	3RD READING	PAGE	206
HR-0405	3RD READING	PAGE	206
HR-0406	3RD READING	PAGE	206
HR-0407	3RD READING	PAGE	206
*HJR-0013	2ND READING	PAGE	207
SJR-0044	3RD READING	PAGE	206
SJR-0048	3RD READING	PAGE	206
SJR-0058	3RD READING	PAGE	206
SJR-0062	3RD READING	PAGE	206

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
JUNE 25, 1979

PAGE 3

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REVEREND KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	208
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	227