

Speaker Redmond: "The House will now come to order. Members please be in their seats. Be...be led in prayer by Father Krueger."

Reverend Krueger: "In the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House this day to Thy service this day. Amen. It is written in the Book of Isaiah the Prophet, 58th Chapter, Verse 11: And the Lord shall guide thee continually and satisfy thy soul in drought, and make fat thy bones: And thou shalt be like a watered garden, and like a spring of water, whose waters fall not. Let us pray. Almighty God, we praise Thy Holy Name for all the blessings of this life which Thou hast given to those who lay their trust in Thee. Our duties as Members of this House of Representatives have become most exacting in these final days of this Session and we pray for Thy sustaining power and strength to be our safeguard, that what we may do will be of pleasure to Thee and beneficial for the people of the State of Illinois; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Pledge of Allegiance. I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. Father didn't say it, but the prayer was dedicated to Chalkie, that part about making fat thy bones. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I think that we ought to suggest to Father Krueger, he should be here not only at the beginning for a prayer but at the end...a prayer each day. That would really make him appreciate what his

early prayer is about."

Speaker Redmond: "Speak for thy self, John Alden. Roll Call for attendance. Cameramen, I didn't turn the light on permitting...taking of pictures so...Representative Bower, go right ahead. Roll Call for attendance. Inadvertently, some switches self-depressed. Only your own switch. Everybody...hit the Attendance Roll Call? Take the record."

Speaker Giorgi: "We will go to the requests for change of votes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Requests for a change of votes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedrich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Friedrich: "Well, I just wondered if it would be possible to recess us until a time certain...we get over here on time and we sit around and fool around and wait for the Leadership on both sides to show up and the Members. And why don't we recess until a time certain and be sure everybody is here."

Speaker Giorgi: "I think that's the plan but we're going to get some stuff out of the way now. They're meeting on the second floor of...the Leadership this morning for a few minutes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Sumner requests a..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Let's get some of this stuff done."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Sumner requests to vote 'no' on Amendment 17 to House Bill 1739. Are there objections? Representative Dave Jones requests to vote 'no' on Senate Bill 1739. Is there objections? Representative Johnson requests to vote 'no' on Amendment #17 to Senate Bill 1739. Are there

objections? Representative Huskey requests to vote 'no' on Amendment #17..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Pardon me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Schraeder, for reason do you arise?"

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, just a point of order. Were those verified Roll Calls? I mean, is that permissible?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Any Roll Call..."

Speaker Giorgi: "...screens them out."

Clerk O'Brien: "If any Roll Calls are verified or it would change the results..."

Speaker Giorgi: "They're not granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "...we disregard the request for a change.

Representative Huskey requests to vote 'no' on Amendment #17 to Senate Bill 1739. Are there objections? Representative Glenn Dawson requests to vote 'aye' on Amendment #17 to Senate Bill 1737. Is there objections? Representative Casey requests to vote 'no' on Amendment #18 on Senate Bill 1739. Is there objections? Representative Donovan requests to vote 'no' on Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1739. Is there objections? Representative Balanoff requests to vote 'aye' on Senate 1632. Is there objections? Representative Marovitz requests to vote 'aye' on Senate 1991. Is there objections? Representative Marovitz..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Darrow, for what reason do you arise? Representative Piel, for what reason do you arise? Piel."

Piel: "Mr. Speaker, just one question. I just happen to notice and I didn't even catch what the name was or what it was, but it was something on Senate Bill 1739,

weren't they all verified? You know, they couldn't change it, they were a verified Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "If any of these Roll Calls were verified or if the vote change would change the results of the vote, they will be disregarded."

Piel: "Okay. Fine. Thank you."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Marovitz requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1993. Are there objections? Representative Marovitz requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1994. Are there objections? Representative Marovitz requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1978. Are there objections? Representative Phllen Requests to vote 'no' on Amendment 8 to Senate Bill 1666. Are there objections? Representative Ewing requests to vote 'aye' on Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1457. Are there objections? Representative Harris requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1759. Is there any objections? Representative Deuster requests to vote...no, he requests immediate consideration...Representative Johnson requests to vote 'aye' on Concurrence on Senate Bill 3003. Are there objections? Representative Deuster...Breslin requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1668. Are there objections? Representative Johnson requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bills 1991 and 1993 and 1994 and 2000. Are there objections? Representative Hallstroma requests to vote 'no' on Senate Bill 2020. Is there objections? Representative Hudson requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1978. Are there objections? Representative Macdonald requests to vote 'no' on

Senate Bill 2020. Are there objections? Representative Sumner requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 2013. Are there objections? Representative Kent requests to vote 'no' on Senate Bill 1884. Are there objections? Representative Winchester requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1642. Are there objections? Representative Boucek requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1884. Are there objections? Representative Bianco requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1505. Are there objections? Representative Ropp requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1505. Are there objections? Representative Mahar requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1639. Is there objections? Representative Hudson requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1747. Are there objections? Representative Greiman requests to vote 'present' on Senate Bill 1505. Are there objections? Representative Satterthwaite requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1815. Are there objections? Representative Hannig requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1810. Is there objections? Representative Murphy requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1750. Are there objections? Representative Satterthwaite requests to vote 'no' on Senate Bill 1747. Is there objections? Representative McPike requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1505. Is there objections? Representative Sumner requests to vote 'no' on Senate Bill 1639. Are there objections? Representative Marovitz requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1747. Are there objections? Representative Reed requests to vote 'no' on Senate Bill 1707. Are there objections? Representative Karpel requests to vote 'aye' on

Senate Bill 1760. Is there objections?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Hearing no objections, the changes shall be journalized. Do you want to go to Agreed Resolutions? Agreed Resolutions, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 919, Johnson. 921, Bradley. 923, Madigan. 924, Slape. 925, Leon. 927, Johnson. 928, Winchester. 930, Wikoff. And, 931, Stanley."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijevich, on the Agreed Resolutions."

Matijevich: "Mr. Clerk, would you pull out 928? I think that's a Death Resolution. 928, I believe, is the death...all right. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the House Resolution 919, Johnson, congratulates the Reverend Doctor Malcolm E. Nygren. 921, directs the Legislative Investigating Commission to investigate the administrative practices at Logan Correctional Center. 923, Madigan, extends warmest congratulations to the Clergy, Sisters and Congregation of St. Rita Parish. 924, Slape, congratulates Mark Campbell who was the pitcher on that winning team we saw. House Resolution 925, Leon, commends the Illinois Credit Union League. House Resolution 927 honors Mr. Thomas, first Director of the Douglas Community Center. House Resolution 930, Wikoff, congratulates and commends Burnham Hospital Auxiliary. House Resolution 931, Stanley-Karpiel, commends Carol Bullieri and American Saddle-Bred Horse Association. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijevich, just for a moment. Look at 921. I think you'll want to pull

House Resolution 921 out. It's an investigation."

Matijevich: "Yeah, I was going to say that we use the Attendance Roll Call because we need 89 votes on that one."

Speaker Giorgi: "No, take that out of the record."

Matijevich: "Take it out. Okay. Remove 921 then, Mr. Speaker. And I now move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Giorgi: "You heard the Gentleman's motion for the...motion to pass all of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' and the opposed'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are passed. Death Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 918, Younge, respects the memory of Mr. Joyce Thomas. House Resolution 922, Reed-Deuster, respects the memory of Robert J. Dixon. House Resolution 926, Mahar-Kelly-Steczo, respects the memory of William E. Williams. House Resolution 928, Winchester, et al, respects the memory of Oscar R. Harris. House Resolution 829, J. David Jones-Oblinger-Kane, respects the memory of Albert John Cross."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move the adoption of the Death Resolutions."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijevich, on the Death Resolutions."

Matijevich: "I move the adoptions."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Death Resolutions are adopted."

Matijevich: "Was Greiman on it? I said, was Greiman on it?"

Speaker Giorgi: "We have a Death Resolution for a former Member that we'll read now. It's read in full."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 920, Simms-Giorgi-Hallock. Whereas, our former colleague of this Body for two terms, 1966 and 1968, the Honorable David W. Johnson, Rockford, Illinois, former Republican Representative from the Thirty-fourth District, died Sunday, June 22, 1980. Whereas, in 1957 he was instrumental in the election of former Mayor Benjamin T. Schleicher, Rockford, Illinois, and was appointed by the Mayor Schleicher to the Rockford Board of Education, chairing the Building and Ground Committee during the period of largest expansion and construction in the school district. And, Whereas, Frank St. Angel, an opposing Democrat member on the Board of Education said that Mr. Johnson, 'He always brought it back to the realities of the community and I had a great respect for his unpretentious counsel. He really loved this city and had deep roots here'. The School Superintendent, Arthur T. Johnson said, 'He really listened. He was concerned about education because he felt good education meant the difference for young people'. And, Whereas, as a State Representative, he served with honor and distinction on the influential House Executive Committee, the Committee on Higher Education, the Illinois Highway Study Committee...Commission, and the Commission on Mental Health. And, Whereas, Mr. Johnson once owned and operated David W. Johnson Realty Office and was President and owner of Photo Shop. He had a long-time

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 25, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

interest in photography. And, Whereas, Mr. Johnson served in many capacities in his early career as he worked for J.L. Clark Manufacturing Company, was Republican Precinct Committeeman in the Tenth Ward of Rockford and was a special deputy in the Winnebago County Sheriff's Department. And, Whereas, in 1962 he received the insignia of the King of Sweden's Royal Order of Basa, was President of the Swedish Historical Society and organizer and board member of the Rockford Historical Society and active in the Illinois State Historical Society. And as a member of the Swedish Trade Fair, he was a guest of honor at a dinner at Chicago Swedish Counsel just last week. And, Whereas, he leaves to mourn his passing, his wife, Helga, his son, David F. and two grandchildren, as well as, us, his former colleagues in this Body and a legion of friends in both political parties. Therefore, Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-First General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we express our sincere sorrow upon the death of our former colleague of this Body, former Republican State Representative, David W. Johnson, Rockford, Illinois. And that we extend our sympathy to the members of his bereaved family. And, be it further Resolved, that a suitable copy of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to his widow, Mrs. Helga Johnson."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Simms, on the Death Resolution."

Simms: "Mr. Chairman, I would move the adoption of the Death Resolution."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Death Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye' and those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. We'll start with Third Reading. Third Reading. Representative Pullen on...are you ready with 1378? Out of the record. I'm sorry. Roll Call for attendance. The first Bill was called out of the...out of order...out of the record. Is Pierce ready...he's not here for Senate Bill 1457. Let's go to a couple of noncontroversial Second Reading Bills just for a few minutes. They assure me that they're noncontroversial. Second Reading. Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bill 1574. Noncontroversial, they tell me. No, I'm not going with that. 1574, Representative Bradley."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1574..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Take the record of the Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "We are. Senate Bill 1574. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Board of Regents. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Giorgi: "Are there any motions to that Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1 by Representative Bradley."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bradley, on the motion."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, this is the...the Amendment was the same one that Mr. Peters put on in Committee, all of the university Bills, and yesterday, if you will recall, we were working on those Bills and left to go back to the Worker's Comp. And Mr. Peters had agreed to remove...not object to the tabling. We took Mr.

Wikoff's...we supported his motion to table Mr. Peter's Amendment on the University of Illinois and the same with Southern Illinois University to get all of the University Bills in exactly the same shape as...as we usually do. So I am moving to table Amendment #1. Mr. Peters has agreed to that and I don't think there is any problem now. Just go ahead and table the Bill. It's the only Amendment on the Bill. It will be in the same shape as the University of Illinois and Southern Illinois. So I move to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bradley moves that the...that we table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1574. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment #1 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Bradley, amends Senate Bill..."

Bradley: "I'd like to table that Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "All right. The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1574. Are there any objections? No objections, leave is granted and Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative...no further Amendments...Third Reading, Senate Bill 1574. Senate Bill 1575."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1575. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any motions to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1 by Representative Keane and Stuffle and...Stuffle."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Keane, on the motion...on...motion to table Amendment #1."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the same situation of...of the Board of Regents, University of Illinois and Southern Illinois University. And I move to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Giorgi: "The motion by Representative Keane is to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1575. Is there any discussion? No discussion. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And table...the Amendment #1 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2 and 3 failed...were withdrawn in Committee...or, 3 and 4, 2 failed, 3 and 4 were withdrawn in Committee. Amendment #5, Williamson-Ewell-Gaines, amends Senate Bill 1575 on page 3 by inserting after the last sentence in Section 1 the following..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me a minute. Representative Bullock, for what reason do you arise?"
Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "I...Representative Williamson is not here. I think Representative Ewell is back here. What do you want to...I think you want to table that Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Keane, on the Amendment."

Keane: "Yes. I had spoken to Representative Williamson earlier and he indicated that he was going to withdraw the Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "And this is agreed to by Representative Ewell. So, are there any objections to the Amendment being withdrawn? There are no objections, the Amendment is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, McGrew-Bradley, amends Senate Bill 1575 on page 3, line 3..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McGrew, on Amendment #6."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is not necessarily uncontroversial. I think it's one of the best Amendments that I've offered since I've been in the House of Representatives. But I defer that through the wisdom of the people involved, Amendment #6 was the nursing program at Western Illinois University. The Board of Higher Education has considered this and as usual, have come up with an alternative to meet the need in Western Illinois. It is with a great deal of reluctance that I ask to table Amendment #6."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Amendment...he asks leave to withdraw Amendment #6. Are there any objections? Leave is granted. Amendment #6 is withdrawn to Senate Bill 1575. Any further Amendments? Jack, any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #7, Keane, amends Senate Bill 1575 on page 1, line 12 and so forth."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Keane on Amendment #7."

Keane: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw Amendment #7."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendment #7. Any objections? No objections, leave is granted. And, Amendment #7 is withdrawn. Any

further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Third Reading. We'll go back to Third Reading...Senate Bills, Third Reading. Oh, I'm sorry. We have Senate Bills, Second Reading, Short Debate Calendar on page 3, Senate Bill 1799."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1799. 1799, John..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative on..."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees Group Insurance Act. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted previously."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any motions to Amendment #1."

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Greiman, amends Senate Bill 1799 on page 1, line..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Greiman, on Amendment #2."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 provides the survivors of employees...or annuitants, with the ability to purchase for themselves a very small amount of money...of life insurance...basically, burial insurance, to the total of two thousand dollars, no more than two thousand dollars. It is totally at their expense. The state will have no expense at all. And I ask that this be added on to the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any discussion? Hearing no discussion, Representative Greiman moves the adoption of Amendment #2. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted."

Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Third Reading. Does he have leave to leave it on Short Debate? No objections, it's on Short Debate. On Second Reading, page 3, Senate Bill 1576."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1576. A Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Community College Board and the Board of Trustees of the State Community College of St. Louis for fiscal year 1981. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any motions to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1 by Representative Stuffle and Keane."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stuffle, on the motion to table Amendment #1."

Stuffle: "Yes, this is the same motion to table that we have taken and accepted on each of the other higher education appropriations. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on the motion to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any discussion? If there be no discussion...Representative Skinner, on the motion to table."

Skinner: "Slight clue of the content?"

Stuffle: "Well, I figured you were aware of this, Cal, I knew you kept up with these things. This puts the Bill back into the shape that it came over to the Senate in. It restores the salary position that we had when the Bill came over, 8 1/2 percent salary increase in the community colleges. It's the same program that we've followed in each of the others."

The same impact with this motion will be had as we've had by tabling the first Amendment to each of the other budget Bills."

Skinner: "But, Representative, the state does not pay community college professors directly."

Stuffle: "I can't hear you, Cal. I was deafened last night by those Amendments."

Skinner: "Well, I'm sorry, it didn't last for ninety days so you're not eligible for workman's compensation...worker's compensation."

Stuffle: "Would you...would you repeat the question?"

Skinner: "Could you tell me whose salary are we raising? We don't pay junior college professors."

Stuffle: "Oh, yes we do, indeed, we help fund that. Because, Cal, in the rate structure of paying the community colleges, we contribute to the community colleges on the basis of local revenue effort by them. We assume a certain fixed tuition cost, we assume a certain effort and then we produce money from the state to make up the difference as to need by credit hours. That assumes in there the need for certain salary amounts."

Skinner: "So what you're doing is just hiking the grants?"

Stuffle: "What?"

Skinner: "Hiking the grant formula."

Stuffle: "Yes, back to where it came from the Senate, an 8 1/2% salary base as opposed to...."

Skinner: "Okay...fine, fine, fine, I understand. Fine, fine, good, good."

Stuffle: "Fine, fine. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Totten, on the motion."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Totten: "My analysis indicates that this Amendment #1 did three things. It also reduced the personal services for the State Community of East St. Louis. Is that correct?"

Stuffle: "Yes, but the same reason would apply. It was a difference in salary. The whole Amendment should...the whole Amendment #1 is intended to relate itself to a reduction of a million, six hundred thousand dollars with regard to salaries. In the East St. Louis Community College is separated out as it always has been in the budget for the community colleges because it's funded differently than the rest of the community colleges in the state."

Skinner: "All right. So that the total that we're restoring is about a million, six hundred and sixty-five thousand dollars?"

Stuffle: "That's correct."

Skinner: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall the motion pass? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2 was withdrawn previously. Floor Amendment #3, Huff, amends Senate Bill 1576 by inserting after the last sentence in Section 2 the following."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Huff, on Amendment #3. Do you know what it contains, Mr. Stuffle?"

Stuffle: "Yes, we oppose Amendment #3...is it #3 or #2?"

It's 3. Representative Huff originally offered the Amendment, I believe, in Committee. The Community College Board is opposed to this. They are reviewing the program involved. It deals with an audio-visual activity in the city colleges of Chicago, I believe, Malcolm X. Community College. They are a number of proposals for the Board. Of course, they must set priorities year to year. This is not within the priorities this year. And for that reason we would oppose it."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Sponsor is not on the floor, Representative Stuffle. Withdraw it. Withdraw the...withdraw the Bill?"

Stuffle: "The Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Withdraw the Amendment?"

Stuffle: "Yes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Stuffle-Keane..."

Stuffle: "Withdraw that...withdraw the Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendment #4. Any objections? No objections, leave is granted. Amendment #4 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Third Reading. Representative Bradley, for what reason do you arise?"

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in this same series of noncontroversial Bills is 1571, Mr. Kane. He's not on the floor but I think it will be all right if we go ahead and move it to Third Reading. It's in the same shape, as I said before, as the University of

Illinois, Southern, the Board of Governors and the Board of Regents and then we would have them all in the same position, and I think that was the agreement. So..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Senate Bill 1571, Representative Kane, who has just arrived. Representative Kane, on Senate Bill 1571. Call 1571."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1571. A Bill for to make an appropriation to the Board of Higher Education. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any motions to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1 by Representative Doug Kane."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kane, on tabling motion #1."

Kane: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the same motion to table that is on the other university Bills. And I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leinenweber, on the motion. Leinenweber, on the motion. There being no request for discussion, the motion...the motion by Representative Kane is to table Amendment #1. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' and those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Kane, amends Senate Bill 1571 on page 1, line 10."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kane, on Amendment #2." Representative Kane, on Amendment #2."

Kane: "Amendment #2...withdraw."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendment #2. Any objections? No objections, leave is granted. Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Third Reading. Representative VonBoeckman asks...asks that we go to a noncontroversial Resolution. Are there any objections to that? There be no objection, we'll go to Resolution 101."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 101 deals with the subject matter that is much talked about in this General Assembly and that's the thirty dollar tax on used...personally sold used vehicles. Last year we passed this and now the revenue department is charging a thirty dollar tax on a junk title vehicle and are charging a thirty dollar tax on trailer..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. VonBoeckman. There is objection from the Republican Leadership so we will pull that out of the record because I said that we would go to noncontroversial Bills. Let's go to Senate Bills, Third Reading. We pulled 1378 out of the record. Is Representative Pierce here on 1457? Out of the record. 1497, Pierce. 1541, Representative Taylor, on Third Reading. Out of the record. 1543 by Taylor, out of the record, 1544, also, 1545. Representative Wikoff, do you want to go with 1572, Third Reading? Out of the record. Richmond, do you want to go with...out of the record. E.G. Steele, 1629. Do you want to go with that, Third Reading? All right. Let's read Senate Bill 1629."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1629..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me a moment...Steele. Representative Bowman, for what reason do you arise?"

Bowman: "Is the Gentleman going to proceed with this Bill on Third Reading or is he planning to move it to another order of business? Okay, if he plans to move it back to Second Reading, I offer an objection at this time."

Speaker Giorgi: "Well, we're on Third Reading, page 2."

Bowman: "I understand we're on Third Reading. I just wanted to know what the Gentleman's intention was with respect to moving the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. E.G. Steele, on Senate Bill 1629, to answer Mr. Bowman's question."

Steele: "Yes, Amendment...House Amendment 5 has been filed. We'd like to have leave to take it back to Second for consideration of that Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bowman, on that point."

Bowman: "I object to that, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Amendment #5 proposes to add two new positions in the division of boiler inspection for the State Fire Marshall. The agency is interested in having these new positions..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Bowman. Excuse me, fellows. Representative J.J. Wolf, for what reason do you arise?"

Wolf: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe the motion before us is to have a Bill brought back to the Order of Second Reading..."

Speaker Giorgi: "There is no motion, not yet, they're just answering each others' questions. I have not received any motions yet."

Wolf: "We're discussing an Amendment that is not even before us?"

Speaker Giorgi: "That's correct. We are answering Representative Bowman's question to Mr. Steele. There is no motion on the floor at this time. And if it's up to Mr. Steele if he wants to make a motion or go with Third Reading. Mr. Steele."

Steele: "I make a move we go to Second to consider the Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman asks leave to go to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Yes, and make that in the form of a motion."

Steele: "I so move."

Speaker Giorgi: "It takes 89 votes. All in favor with...with supporting...Mr. Bowman, on the motion. Mr. Bowman, on the motion."

Bowman: "Yes, I think this motion deserves to be debated because what we are being asked to consider, if we get back to Second Reading, is the Amendment by which the agency seeks to add some new positions. I want to point out to the Member of the House that this request of the agency was not heard in either the Senate or the House Appropriations Committee. This is a brand new request. I spoke with the Bureau of the Budget Director, Doctor Mandeville, yesterday. He says the Bureau does not support this Amendment. It seems to me that this is a...a cheap, back door way of trying to raise the head count in an agency. They didn't have the courage to come in through the front door and ask the Appropriations Committee in either Chamber for these new positions. I think that we ought to reject

this motion, keep the Bill on Third Reading and pass it out."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedrich, on the motion."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I thought it was the function of the Legislature to appropriate money to the agencies, not the Bureau of the Budget. As far as I'm concerned, you could abolish the Bureau of the Budget and we could handle it quite all right without them. So if you're going to take your direction from them, you're going to be led astray many times."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Chapman, on the motion."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I agree with Mr. Bowman and hope you will oppose this motion. The Appropriations II Committee simply, as Mr. Friedrich has suggested, has given consideration to the budget for this agency. We have discussed it. We have debated it. We have voted on this Bill and sent it to the floor. This is a surprise to me that these two additional positions have been requested. Nobody has...has mentioned this up until this very moment. It was not discussed with me. It was not discussed in Committee. It did not come up..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "...in the Senate."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mrs. Chapman. Representative Steele, do you have an inquiry of the Chair or..."

Steele: "Yes, there's evidently some misunderstanding. The Bill was brought before the Appropriations Committee. Subsequent to that time, with the passage here in the House...creating the new nuclear agency...nuclear energy agency, six of the inspectors are going to be

transferred over to the nuclear agency and we're trying to replace the six lost with two new ones, two..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Steele."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, you recognized me..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mrs. Chapman, continue with your motion."

Chapman: "Yes, Sir, it seems to me if we have a new agency that new agency should come in and ask for a budget. And we should not be trying to slip in extra positions that are...are going to make it possible at a later time for the House to...with great difficulty, it will almost make it impossible for the House and Senate to know how much this new agency is going to cost us. This new agency should come in and ask for their dollars. They shouldn't try to sneak them in in another agency's budget. I oppose the motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mugalian, on the motion."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This...this is a most puzzling proposal to add two more inspectors to the boiler division of the State Fire Marshall. The Committee on State Government Organizations spent weeks considering this new department. Now we heard the testimony in good faith. And we were told by representatives of the Governor's office that there will be a transfer of some existing inspectors in the State Fire Marshal, but no more. And we expected any...any new personnel that may be needed by this brand new department will be engaged by the new department, and after the Appropriations Committees of this Legislature studied those requests. This is a very mysterious proposal and I urge that..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Representative Mugalian, just a moment. Representative Totten, for what reason do you arise? What's your point of order?"

Totten: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. We don't have the Amendment before us. We're on a motion. Three or four speakers have gotten up, they're debating the Amendment. They're out of order. We don't have an Amendment before us. What's...if we're going to bring it back to Second Reading, go with the Gentleman's motion. If we're not, let's not. Then we can debate the Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Your point is well taken, except that I was enjoying the debate."

Totten: "No exceptions."

Speaker Giorgi: "Correct. Mr. Mugalian, speak to the motion please, the Gentleman, Steele, wants to move this Bill from Third to Second."

Mugalian: "I would urge that, since we know the purpose of the motion, that we're just wasting this Body's time. It's a motion that doesn't deserve any consideration and the motion ought to be defeated."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leverenz, on the motion, please."

Leverenz: "Move the previous question."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question on the motion. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' and the opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the previous motion prevails. Representative Steele, to close on your motion to move the Bill from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment."

Steele: "Yeah, this is a very timely Amendment with the

creation of the new nuclear agency which is going to take six boiler inspectors and move them over to the new nuclear agency. This Amendment would really result in a net loss of four inspectors to the Fire Marshal's office, but it is a minimum working number that they need to do the job that necessary in the state. It's a net loss of four as it is but we feel it is timely at this time to add the two to replace the six already going to be lost. And I urge your approval of this motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Steele moves that Senate Bill 1629 be moved from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. All in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. It takes 89 affirmative votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk.

On this question there are 107 'ayes', 23 'nays' and 1 voting 'present' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. The Bill is now back on Second Reading. It has been read a second time. Has the Amendment been circulated? The Amendments have been circulated. Representative Steele, on Amendment...on the Amendment to Senate Bill 1629. Read the Amendment."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #5, Steele-Mulcahey, amends Senate Bill 1629 as amended."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Steele, on Amendment #5."

Steele: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment 5 is timely because we have voted in recent days to create the nuclear energy agency which is going to then, absorb and be transferred from the Fire Marshal's office...six

boiler inspectors. They're going to lose six inspectors. And to carry on the vital functions of this department, we're asking that those six lost be replaced by two. The overall cost here is still less than the Governor's budget. It's less than the Governor's budget, and we're talking about, in this Amendment, an additional cost of only thirteen thousand dollars. That is the net cost of this Amendment, thirteen thousand dollars, still much less than the Governor's originally proposed budget. It's going to replace the six lost with two boiler inspectors. It is a bipartisan Amendment, sponsored by myself and Representative Mulcahey. And I urge your support of this needed two boiler inspectors."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bowman, on the Amendment."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that it's important that everyone understand precisely why this Amendment is being offered. And it alleged that these new positions are needed in order to protect the State Fire Marshal's office from a raid by a new agency which is not yet even come into existence. We don't know precisely when the new agency will come into existence. It will be sometime this fall, but we don't know exactly when. Moreover, we don't know when those new inspectors will be absorbed into the new agency. It could be as late as next spring. I see no reason why we should give this agency or any agency money to spend that they will have in their budget, that they will be able to encumber and spend, when we don't know exactly what the...the intentions of the Governor's office is going

to be with respect to transferring. There is no information that we have before us now that we didn't have at the time the Bill was introduced, first in the Senate and then later heard in the House. The Bill as introduced in the Senate gives the agency six new positions. Now, mind you, it has ten positions at the present time. The six new positions is a sixty percent increase in that agency's budget for that particular division. The Senate cut them back to two and the House restores the six. They are going to be able to get six new positions if this Amendment fails. If this Amendment succeeds they're going to get eight new positions. That's an eighty percent increase. Now why are we being asked to consider an Amendment like this on the floor at this time when the question has not even been raised in the Senate Committee, nor in the House Committee. We gave this Bill a fair hearing. However, we considered the management practices of the agency to be so sloppy as we...as to cause the House Appropriations Committee to form a Subcommittee that will review the agency on a quarterly basis. I think that if the agency has been behaving in a sloppy manner in the past, we should not reward it by giving it an eighty percent increase in its budget for this particular division when we have no idea as to exactly how that money will be spent, when the transfers will take place or any of those other important related questions. So I urge the defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "There are ten people that want to speak on this issue. Representative Mugalian, on the

Amendment."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to be very brief. We're talking about six new boiler inspections...inspectors for the Department of Nuclear Safety. I want to indicate to you what a hoax that is, what a rip-off it is. There are only seven nuclear reactors in the State of Illinois. There's only...isn't that right? Only seven. How much time will these inspectors have to spend inspecting seven sites. You ought to have six of them, they can sleep there, eat there and spend the entire year inspecting a boiler. The testimony before the Committee on State Government Organization was, however, that the boiler inspectors never inspected the nuclear reactor boilers because they had no idea what they did or how to inspect them. This is such a technical, complicated, expert specialized form of work that we don't even have...our people couldn't do that kind of work. So to...to say they're going to transfer six, where they never did any work before, to a new agency and add two more indicates to me that somebody just wants to have some patronage jobs to state government. I think that if you're involved or interested in economy and our poor suffering taxpayer, you'll reject this Amendment out of hand."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Campbell, on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. So, the question is, shall the previous question be put? All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the previous

question is put. Representative Steele, to close...explain your vote. Representative Steele, to close."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a very good Amendment. And if we would all support this in other matters we would be doing a service to the people of this state and to the taxpayers. This agency is losing sixty-six thousand dollars transferring six positions over to the new Department of Nuclear Safety. They're going to lose sixty-six thousand. This Amendment puts back thirteen thousand for a net loss of over fifty thousand dollars. I think that this is a very reasonable Amendment and I think it should be supported. Now everybody that has spoken on this issue, who voted to create the new Department of Nuclear Safety, when they voted for the new Department they automatically, according to the Bureau of the Budget, voted also to transfer with that department the six new safety inspectors from the Fire Marshal's office. They're going to lose six positions. They're going to lose sixty-six thousand dollars. We asking to replace that sixty-six thousand with only thirteen thousand by this Amendment. I think it's a very reasonable and frugal Amendment and deserving of the whole-hearted support of everybody here. And I urge your approval."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall Amendment #5 be adopted? All in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Robbins, to explain his vote for one minute."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker, I had my light on

through the motions, through the debate and I would like to say that we need the money put in the Bill, not necessarily to replace these two positions but to fill the positions that were left vacant in southern Illinois for the last two years in order to try to conform with the budget. Just because we live down there where they're a good way apart, the nursing homes need to be inspected, the stores need to be inspected and the Fire Marshal's office needs to function in our area. So the Fire Marshal's office needs this money. They need one person and they need put him to work down in our area."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Chapman, on the...to explain her vote."

Chapman: "I don't usually explain my vote under these circumstances, but I think the House should know that in the Appropriations II Committee, we added money to this agency's budget, one hundred and twenty thousand, eight hundred dollars. And it really doesn't make much sense that having been treated well by the Committee that they should now on the floor ask for positions which they cannot use and do not need."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 98 'ayes', 34 'nays' and 2 voting 'present'. And this Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Third Reading again. Representative C.M. Stiehl, on Senate Bill 1630. Senate Bill 1630."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1630. A Bill for an Act to revise for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office

of Lieutenant Governor. Second Reading of the Bill...I'm sorry. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stiehl, on Senate Bill 1630."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1630 appropriates five hundred and twenty-three thousand for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Office of the Lieutenant Governor. I would ask for approval."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Cullerton, on the...Senate Bill 1630."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Giorgi: "She indicates she will. Representative Stiehl, a question from Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "What is the increase over last year?"

Stiehl: "It's a 6.5 percent increase. It's a very tight budget."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1630 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 116 'ayes', 7 'nays', 6 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. And, vote Richmond 'aye'. Senate Bill 1662, Representative Telcser Is he on the floor? Representative Telcser, is he on the floor? Out of the record. Representative Grossi, on Senate Bill 1706. Read 1706, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1706. A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Grossi, on Senate Bill 1706."

Grossi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1706 is an attempt to address the child abuse as it presently appears to be a great problem in the State of Illinois. This Bill is very simple. It recognizes the state as a special interest in the protection of minor children. This Bill creates a new offense, a Class II felony called aggravated battery of a child. A child is defined under this Bill as a person under the age of 13. The battery would be committed by a person of...over the age of 17. Battery, as defined in this Bill, does not mean mere spanking. What we are concerned with here is mutilation of children, broken bones, multiple injuries. This Bill is an attempt to address the child abuse that is presently being defined...or, presently being reported by the Department of Children and Family Services. Under this Bill there is a special sentencing provision for parents or the spouse of parents which allows them to entry a plea of guilty and allow the judge have them report to the Department of Children and Family Services for a period of two years. Then at the conclusion of that term that they will be discharged if they satisfactorily complete that period of two-year probation. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have on this issue."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall...Representative Borchers, on Senate Bill 1706."

Borchers: "I want to tell you what happened just two weeks ago in my community. A little two-year...they brought this child to my office that I had helped in another matter because the father...the real father was a naval person in Jacksonville, Florida and I'm getting him transferred back on recruiter duty in Decatur. Anyway, the little boy, two years old, just as cute as he could be, was taken by the boyfriend...and the Bill here says, any person, including spouse and so on, so this Gentleman...I take that back. I won't call him a Gentleman, he's a no-good SOB. Anyway, he took this little boy, put his feet...both feet in scalding water as punishment. Then he took him over...put him over his knee, pulled down his pants and stabbed him twenty-seven times with a darning needle. Then he beat him...that he had to have...I've seen the scars. I saw the scar on his stomach where he beat him, where he had to have...be operated on to have his spleen partially removed and taken care of. Well now, he's been sentenced to the penitentiary, justly so. But where...with a Bill like this and with this kind of aggravated assault, I think we should certainly pass this Bill...all of us. Every light should be green. Because I've never heard of a more...in fact, Judge Scott, one of our judges, said that it was the worst case, the most cruel type of child beating that ever had come before him. And the hospital said that this little boy just missed death. Well, he came the closest to death than any beaten child that they had ever seen. So I don't think there should be a red vote up there because this is happening elsewhere in

the State of Illinois now and then and we should do something to be sure that we do everything to stop all of that kind of action that we can do. We should take every opportunity. So vote all green."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Cullerton, on Senate Bill 1706."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield please? Representative Grossi, the crime that you've defined, right now, would that be considered to be aggravated battery?"

Grossi: "Yes it would."

Cullerton: "And that would be Class III felony?"

Grossi: "Yes it would."

Cullerton: "And this Bill...in this Bill you're making it a Class II felony?"

Grossi: "Yes, a greater offense."

Cullerton: "Okay. There were Amendments adopted...were there any Amendments adopted on this Bill?"

Grossi: "There were two Amendments adopted, one in Committee and one on the House floor."

Cullerton: "What did the Amendment in the Committee do?"

Grossi: "The Amendment in Committee deleted the nonprobation aspect of the offense and also deleted the Class II felony classification. The House floor Amendment reinserted the Class II felony classification."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1706 pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 147 'ayes', 3 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. And Senate Bill 1706 having

received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Mautino, on Senate Bill 1726. Read 1726, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1726. A Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mautino, on Senate Bill 1726."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to open the remarks and have Representative Cal Schuneman, the other major Cosponsor, give the closing. As you know, 1726 came over from the Senate and was amended both in the Labor and Commerce Committee and on the House floor. It put the provision of compliance that was directed by the Federal Government as it pertains to pensions and unemployment compensation. It also addressed the identical provision in 2824 which was the agreed Bill on involuntary quits. Many of the provisions are the same. There was an Amendment adopted, as well, addressing the question of municipal employees at the Cook County Jail. And that Amendment was put on here on the House floor, not exceeding twenty-nine work days. I think that this legislation is...is part of the package of 2824 that we sent out of the House. And I would now like to relinquish to any questions that may be on this subject."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hanahan, on Senate Bill 1726."

Hanahan: "Would the Gentleman yield? Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Hanahan: "Representative, what is the difference between this...these provisions in this Bill that we're voting on now and the agreed Bill that was sent to the Senate? Would you explain the three differences?"

Mautino: "I don't happen to have the...2824 is front of me, Tom. If you'll give me about a minute, I'll compare both out, unless Cal has 2824 over there."

Speaker Giorgi: "Did your question get answered, Mr. Hanahan?"

Hanahan: "No, he's looking it up."

Mautino: "There's a difference on the question of suitable employment, number one, that is in this Bill that is not the other. It says basically that if a person accepts...does not accept suit...if a person accepts suitable employment, he does not come under provisions that are in 2824, which would make him immediately eligible for unemployment compensation if he voluntarily left that job as well. For example, if a carpenter was laid off the job and took a position as a gas station attendant and then voluntarily left that job..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Mautino. The TV lights are on. They're taking pictures. The Members ought to be aware the television cameras are taking pictures. Continue, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Okay. This provision says that...this provision differs from 2824 whereby he does not automatically become eligible for his previous unemployment compensation benefits under the suitable work provision. That's the one main issue I think you're

getting at."

Hanahan: "All right. Well, Representative, when you say that this would somehow inhibit a person from taking any employment when for a temporary position...it would inhibit him from even seeking temporary employment at a lesser wage or a lesser type of condition knowing that if he does this and was laid off he would not be able then to collect unemployment benefits on his typical or normal work?"

Mautino: "Tom, I agree with you in total. I also held this Bill on Second Reading for a possible Amendment. I've talked to people who are interest in it. I agree with you, the Amendments were not presented. I had discussed it earlier...later last evening with the Senate Sponsor. And since there were no Amendments, I would like to call this Bill and if those changes should be made I would hope they would be made in the Senate because I did promise them last night I would call the Bill. I agree with your philosophy on this issue. It should have been changed but it wasn't. And I'd like to have them take care of it in the Senate."

Hanahan: "Well, has this Bill been amended? There's 1, 2, 5 and 6 in the House."

Mautino: "Yes, Sir."

Hanahan: "It has to go back to the Senate."

Mautino: "Yes, Sir."

Hanahan: "But what agreement do you have that the Senate will nonconcur with these Amendments so that we can address ourselves to the very issue I'm pointing out here?"

Mautino: "Because by sending this over, as I understand it, there could be technical error in the provision for the municipal employees that has to be changed anyway, as it was drafted. So, therefore, I know it will go in a Conference Committee."

Hanahan: "Well, yes, but it doesn't necessarily mean that it will go to Conference because it it's a technical error they could address themselves to a simple Amendment and all of a sudden we end up with a change in the unemployment compensation law. That in this particular case, and I want the Members who are more conservative than I am on this issue on unemployment insurance, that if this provision, as I pointed out, goes into the Unemployment Compensation Act would...in effect, what you're doing is going to drain the trust fund more by an inhibition of people not wanting to take any kind of employment for temporary purposes. What...what it will really do, and I think this Bill should be defeated right now, I...I don't believe that we should gamble on what the Senate will do. Because what you're going to do, you're going to take people who work seasonally and you're going to force them to not seek any kind of temporary help and just draw unemployment comp. on their main job. But right now you and I know that there's many tradesmen, there's many other kinds of employment in this state where it's seasonal and where a person will take a temporary job at a lesser wage so that they don't have to go through the harrassment and through all of the other kinds of bureaucratic nonsense that you have to go through in order to collect unemployment compensation.

I plead to you to understand this. I am not opposed to this Bill for other reasons. It's just on this one issue and it's a bad issue. Because I don't want to be blamed for the greater drain on that trust fund that has already taken place. And if you vote for this right now, what you're saying is that when you're unemployed from your job, don't take anything else, don't do another damn thing for a job, just go and collect unemployment comp. And that's what you're saying if you vote for this Bill as it is presently drawn. I think it should be defeated, either that or taken back to Second Reading and amended so that this will not take place. Because I predict, this is going to drain the trust fund. This is one time when those of you who are more conservative than me ought to take a hard look at exactly what you're voting on in this Bill. And I urge a 'no' vote or a 'present' vote at the present time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Brummer: "All right, 2824 incorporated the agreed Bill, or was the agreed Bill, you had indicated in your opening remarks that this incorporated those provisions and other provisions. I know the agreed Bill process is a formal process. Have you had any informal contact with the parties to the agreed Bill process that they are in agreement with regards to the additional provisions that are in this this or the different provisions that are in this Bill that were not 2824?"

Mautino: "Well, Representative Hanahan alluded to one

provision that is not included in 2824, and the second is in writing. I've talked to Senate Sponsors of the legislation. It came over...overwhelmingly from the Senate as...as their proposal. And in...but in talking to the two Senate Sponsors, they would like to see it, since there were no other Amendments offered at this time, to send it out the way it is and they would be..."

Brummer: "No, no, no. I'm referring to entities commonly referred to as business and labor. Are they in agreement with the additional provisions?"

Mautino: "Not totally."

Brummer: "Who is not?"

Mautino: "Tom Hanahan and...and Mike Klein of U.A.W. on that same provision for the municipal workers that was drafted incorrectly. I'm certain it's going to be corrected in the Senate. That's all I'm saying."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Schuneman. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill. As Representative Mautino has said, the Bill is very, very similar to House Bill 2824, which passed out of here with bipartisan support. This Bill, I think, differs in one significant aspect. And that is, it puts perhaps a little tougher elimination in the law for people who voluntarily give up their jobs. And it's a measure which certainly I can support. As I understand the difference here, if an individual voluntarily left his job to take another job, was out of work and then decided to take it...to take a job

which he later voluntarily quit because he thought that job was unsuitable for him, that that individual would not be eligible for unemployment benefits. And I think that's precisely what most of us here think that the law ought to be. And, so there is that minor difference between this Bill and the one...House Bill 2824 which was earlier passed. And I think we should support this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Will the Sponsor yield? Cal, did you just address yourself to voluntary quits?"

Schuneman: "I beg your pardon."

Mulcahey: "Did you just address yourself to the issue of voluntary quits?"

Schuneman: "Yes."

Mulcahey: "Well, I hate to ask you to answer that question again. But would you...how does this Bill differ from, regarding voluntary quits as it is right now compared to the way it has been in legislation currently?"

Schuneman: "As I understand the difference, Dick, both Bills address themselves to voluntary quits. But in this particular Bill, the...it is somewhat more restrictive on the person who may voluntarily leave a job which he thinks is unsuitable for him. There is an exemption under...that Bill...that particular situation is not exempted under 2824, whereas it is exempted here."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will

take the record. On this question there's 106 'aye' and 20 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1729, Representative Schneider. Representative Leverenz, 'aye', on 1729. 1729. Out of the record. 1730...out of the record. He's not on the floor. 1762. Is Representative Daniels in the Chamber? Is Daniels in the Chamber?"

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1762. A Bill for an Act in relation to assume corporate names amending certain Acts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1762 was heard before the Judiciary Committee. And what it does, it amends the Business Corporation Act in the assumed name Act. It permits a corporation to use any divisional designation or trade name without complying with the Assumed Named Act. Presently under Illinois you must comply with that Act in that you must...and are prohibited from putting up a name other than the name that you register the corporation. This is a corrective measure. It's supported by the International Franchise Association and the Secretary of State. It cleared the Senate by a vote of 49 to 0. I know of no opposition to it. And I seek your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this...Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Representative Daniels, if I owned a MacDonalds in Joliet, I would have to comply with the assumed name. Is that correct?"

Daniels: "That is correct."

Leinenweber: "If I owned it, but if MacDonald's owned it then they would not have to, is that..."

Daniels: "No, they would...they would still have to. But they have a right to use the name of MacDonalds because they are the owner of it. But if you bought it..."

Leinenweber: "Let's say if it was 'Esmark' or something like that, that actually owned MacDonalds. Let's say 'Esmark' has about twenty-five different companies, they can...they don't have to comply with each individual company under the assumed name? Is that the intent of...?"

Daniels: "That is the intent. That is what we are correcting, yes."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Daniels: "Seek your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 145 'aye' and 0 'nay'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. You've got to sign the slip. 1812."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1812. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jane Barnes is recognized to make overtures on 1812."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this has been

a Bill that has been discussed on many, many occasions. And I am sure at this point, with the help of Ted Leverenz, that everybody knows what the Bill contains. Many Amendments that many Representatives felt would make the Bill better are also included now. So I see no reason why this Bill is not acceptable to the majority of the Members of the House. So I would encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Sponsor...the sponsor of this program says that we all know what it is and what it contains. We all know what it contains right now. We also ought to know that this particular Bill, if it gets out of the House, will go into a Conference Committee and will come back at us the same way it was before. Because I am certain that this program, in its present condition, is not acceptable and does not meet the needs of those folks who supported it in its original form. If we want to lay this issue to rest today, we will vote the same way that we voted on the House version of this program. And that is, as a Body, we will reject this effort on the part of certain groups in our state to take a public money for private purposes which you and I know is contrary to the Education Article in the Constitution. I, too, feel the same way that the Sponsor does and that is that this does not need a great deal of discussion. We know what's in it. We had some interesting experiences last time we heard the Bill on Second Reading by putting a couple of Amendments on which

seemed to me would indicate the direction in which the House wishes to take on this issue. And that is, that we should put this issue to rest once and for all, right this morning, and we can do that by voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the Representative who just spoke talked about public money for private purposes. This Bill has nothing to do with public money for private purposes. We take public money and we build public highways. We take public money and we provide police protection. We take public money, we provide fire protection and police protection and sewer service. We do a lot of things that are neutral that benefit all taxpayers. This Bill has been much debated and discussed, of course, but essentially it deals with providing public transportation. In fact, our Illinois Constitutional says that funds may be used for the purpose of public transportation. This is a transportation Bill. It's a Bill for the safety of children, no matter where they may be going when they get off of their buses. This is a public transportation Bill, and I would urge support for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, good morning, everybody. I guess we do know that the Bill has been discussed in a variety of forms over the last year, and I don't want to again beat a dead horse, hopefully a dead Bill. But, basically what we're discussing again, is something that Representative Hoffman had

raised with a specific reference to use of money money for private purposes as they relate to religious institutions or...or those kinds of purposes. What is really clear, and I've cited it many times and I'm sure that other documents have cited it, that we have in Illinois the very precise language that relates to the question of whether or not public monies can be used for the purposes that are outlined in this Bill. So, number one, I don't think there's any doubt in the minds of those that have looked at the constitution that there certainly is no question about the prohibition that we have against the use of these kinds of public monies. So I think it's a clear issue. I don't think we can duck that one. Secondly, a number of years ago, a lot of discussion emerged around the question of whether or not the child should be entitled to this kind of bus transportation for reasons that are related to safety. Well, a couple of years ago we did deal with that. The laws relating to private transportation for children on a bus had prior stated that you had to transport kids in private schools along a route that was already in place, that is to say, in place for public schools. We changed that a number of years ago to argue that we would transport these kinds of kids for purposes of safety and convenience. That's a broadening of that language, and this Assembly passed it. And it does not seem sensible to me to hear people argue that we are not taking into consideration the safety of those children who attend schools other than public. So I don't know how we can justify supporting a proposition

that, number one, is...violates the Illinois Constitution. Number two, purportedly argues that we are not concerned about the safety of the children. And, number three, the one that has been mentioned many times and which many of the Members of this General Assembly will respond to maybe on other issues, and that is the cost. We have had a variety of ranges of estimates depending on whether or not to use the private school estimate or whether or not to use the estimates derived staff on both sides of the aisle. We know the range is up to twenty million dollars. The bottom out number that the Sponsor has talked about is three million dollars. We have calculated as best we can, depend on the issues as they relate to the figures given to us by the State Board of Education, that if we use the dollars for calculating...use the cost for calculating this kind of expenditure, it's more accurate to use the figure for special education because we know special ed kids are not following the normal routes of the regular children. And that's pretty much what would be characteristic on the kinds of transportation we would provide under this Bill. Children going to adjacent districts, going within a district, are not going to be going along the routes that are customary for regularly transported public school kids. That means that when you talk about a bottom number provided by the State Board of Education, you may say five million. When you talk about a number that's closer to special education transportation, and this is a mirror in part of that kind of transportation. You're

looking at twenty or twenty-five million dollars, based on the last fiscal year, not on the anticipated year that we are about to enter. I find it unfortunate that the Bill will continue to come forward. I find it unfortunate that a lot of people cannot read and comprehend the clarity of the Illinois Constitution. It's hopeful that we can defeat the Bill and hopeful that we will not reemerge in another Session. I solicit again a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. Many of those who oppose Senate Bill 1812 using the same philosophy that those who oppose the textbook program had. What happens now is that we find that seventy-five percent or more of the textbooks are used by public school systems. So often times what starts out as a...an aid to private education ends up an aid to state education. In terms of the economics of this Bill, let's take a close look at it. Many of the downstate schools presently are getting caught, private schools are getting caught in a crunch where the escalating transportation are beginning to exceed tuition costs. If that should happen and there should be a decline in enrollment because parents can no longer afford the bussing...the private bussing costs, they will send their children to the public schools. At that point, the state will have the opportunity to pay the hundred and fifty dollar average that we pay now for public school busing. And we will also have the opportunity to pay fifteen hundred dollars to our formula for that child. Economically, the smartest

move for anyone in the General Assembly is to vote to maintain the private school system which is saving the state substantial amounts of money. In terms of the bussing, we now have the...the bussing is legal within a district. And what we're saying is that...the fact that private school districts or private school service areas do not conform to public school districts may be accidental. The public school district lines have been set for a number of reasons, many times historical. The Catholic schools or the private schools...or the religious schools have a different district that they serve. I don't think that we should force them to stay within the...the public school district lines. A five mile limitation in, as the Bill is now stated, within district bussing programs, is much, much preferable. And I urge your favorable support of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bell."

Bell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will...she will."

Bell: "Representative Barnes, because I am a little confused on this, who is paying for this now, is it the state or the school district?"

Barnes: "It's the state."

Bell: "All right. Is Chicago included?"

Barnes: "No, it is not."

Bell: "Well, I'd like to speak briefly to the Bill. It seems to me that this is a chance, I guess, for downstate to make some money off the City of Chicago. Many downstate Legislators complained in the past

years about having to pay money as their money for RTA, now downstate gets to get some Chicago's money for bussing private students. And if Chicago Legislators agree with that philosophy, I suppose they would want to vote for the Bill. I rise in opposition to this Bill. I don't think Chicago wants to pay for downstate bussing and I don't think downstate wants to pay for this bussing. And I would encourage everyone to 'no'. And because we have had such a long Session last night, we've got a lot of work ahead of us, please everybody vote your own switch. Thank you."

~~Speaker Redmond:~~ "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen has moved the previous question. The question is 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried. Representative Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would just like to make a few brief comments. There is a Gentleman from DuPage that is constantly up on educational issues and constantly has his budget over the proposed education budget to the tune of tens of millions of dollars. And when he gets up for his own causes he tells us all it's just a miniscule amount and not to be bothered about it. I would like you to know that this particular Bill will give monetary relief to parents. And that's what it's all about and that's what we're trying to do. And we've been trying very hard to do it and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Schraeder, to explain his vote."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I have great admiration for two of the Gentleman that serve on the Education Commission and also on the Committee. They happen to be misinformed on this subject and their prejudices are to the floor on this issue. They're trying to say that they support the concept that we ought to give safety to our schools...to the school children. And yet, they're excluding a great many in the State of Illinois from that same safety. They can't justify it. They've thrown red herrings all over the place. They've talked about the constitutionality. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, we are not a judging Body, we're a Legislative Body and that's up for the courts to decide. And I think it happens to be constitutional. As as far as reimbursement, the local districts raised the issue they couldn't afford it so we put it on the state to pay the cost. That's a reasonable thing to do. And it just seems to me that we ought to give every student a right for safe transportation to school. We're only going within this district boundary lines, we're not going five miles or ten miles as the original Bills proposed. And I think we all ought to get on there and give it 89 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm alarmed to hear some of these people talk about what a terrible cost this is, the RTA not getting support from southern

Illinois. We, in southern Illinois do support the people from the Chicago area that need our vote in that particular deal, but now to the question of transporting these pupils safely. In our area where I come from we have many private schools. When the public school has to have a bond issue to increase educational rates for public schools, they meet with the private school people and get support and get votes. Those same people tax themselves to pay for the public schools' transportation, twenty cents in our area. Another thing, the educational bonds for new buildings, they vote and tax themselves to house the public school people. And I think that it is only right that we give the private school people this privilege of having transportation for their children, safe transportation for all of the children of the State of Illinois. An 'aye' vote is the right vote on this particular Bill. And I hope that you see the light and put some more green lights on that board."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. We're talking about transportation, transportation for children, not for education of children. I sometimes wonder why we appropriate any money to pay transportation costs of any children in this state. I think our money ought to go to educating them rather than some other purpose. But if we're going to pay to transport some, then we ought to pay to transport all of them. You put on an Amendment to abolish their transportation fund, I'll vote for it. But as long as we're going to pay for it, we

ought to pay for it all. And I urge more people to vote green on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I voted against 3580 and I voted against 101 because I did have some concern about the school districts having to pick up this large amount of money, this two million dollars. But since it going to be borne by the state, it will not break any local school district. And I agree with the last Speaker that if, you know, we should...there's nothing in the Constitution that guarantees the right of children transportation. Therefore, we should either transport all kids or none. The major states in our country have already addressed this problem, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and I think Illinois ought to follow."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in opposition, again, to this and 101 and 3580 all for the same reasons. We can't afford to run one school system correct now. We keep going into the bussing business a little more. If this goes to a Conference Committee it'll probably be very shocking as it comes back in a totally different form. The Sponsor was correct. She's out to get indirect tax relief for a certain class of people. We're going to subsidize the non-public schools, we're going to go into the bussing business. We'll end up with coordinators in our public schools for making sure the bussing program is going correctly, instead of in the education business. No one has addressed the cost of the liability. In

addition to the cost of the bussing program, it's a reimbursement but no one address the fact of who pays for it in the interim. Now certainly our schools cannot do it. Certainly the Sponsor all but agreed that it was a guaranteed income tax...or a guaranteed raise in taxes at the local level. And I would ask for a verification if it gets 89."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's most unfortunate on this issue that we have the leading educators that are Members of this Legislature standing up in opposition displaying that they never did pass their reading comprehension test. The Illinois Constitution in no way prevents public money being used for private purposes in this area or in the other area. The Constitution clearly says that money may not be used for sectarian purposes. Providing transportation to young school kids is not...is not a sectarian purpose. It's a practical purpose that allows their parents to get their children to school. Our nation was based and built upon private schools which eventually became public providing public education to all students. There is no earthly reason why we should not provide public education...public transportation to all students wherever they go to school. I take issue with the comments that have been made by the other people and point out that probably the only bad thing about this Bill is the Senate Sponsorship. Otherwise, it's a very fine Bill, and we should support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I feel that I'm partly responsible for the Bill being back here today. I do believe that had I not raised some objection a few days ago, House Bill 3580 would have passed out of here. And, even though Representative Barnes did not vote for the Equal Rights Amendment, which I pushed so hard for. I'm not going to let my personal vendetta stand in the way of what I think is good for the State of Illinois and for the kids of all communities. I am going to vote in support of House...Senate Bill 1812, because I know what the Catholic priests have done for the kids in my community and what they have done for my race throughout the country, and I support House Bill...Senate Bill 1812."

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

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me give you an example of what this Bill would do. I have three grandchildren who live within the Galesburg school district. Because they live just barely within the mile and one half limit from the school which they are required to attend, they must furnish their own transportation. As I would understand this Bill, if they wanted to go to a parochial school rather than the public school, the school district would be required to transport them. I think that is unfair treatment. It is discrimination against people such as my grandchildren in Galesburg, and I, for that reason, must vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of this Bill. I think it's an excellent Bill. The Bill passed the Senate. It has some merit. As Representative Leinenweber said, we're not funding transportation. Many of these kids are getting quality educations, and, quite frankly, if the public school system had to absorb these students, it would cost the State of Illinois a lot more money than it would cost them to bus them to bus them to the schools where they are presently being educated. I would encourage each and every Member in this House to vote ~~green on this measure.~~"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Reluctantly, in a sense, because as I said before, this Sponsor has done a tremendous job in trying to put this together. I must oppose this Bill for the same reasons that I've been saying. And, I hope everybody will remember the public schools are getting it from every angle, and they can't now pay the bills that they have. We keep mandating them. We keep telling them we're going to fully fund and we don't. So, it does not make sense to me to start another program when we're not fully funding the programs that we have. And, as far as hearing from the parents, I've heard from many, many parents in my district and each one of you think of the numbers of parents that you've heard from. Now, these are parents who feel they want to have their children in public schools. It is not fair not to be able to fully fund the public school system and then turn

around and start another program. One more issue. I'm sure all of you realize this Bill has come back here so many times, and this Bill that's going out with just transporting kids within the district is not going to stay that way because the people who have been pushing for this Bill will not let it stay that way. So, if you think you're voting for a Bill that just transports children within the public school system within their own district, you are sadly mistaken and you're going to get a Bill that transports kids five to ten miles outside the school district. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "I wonder if I might ask a question of the Sponsor, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. She indicates she'll respond."

Jones: "Isn't it true, Jane, that at the present time, the taxpayers pay for driver's education, for textbooks, for school lunches. These are nonsect...these are sectarian. These are nonreligious objects, and that...the state is now paying that, and I don't see any difference in this. And I urge your support for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 91 'aye' and 63 'no'. Representative Leverenz has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Barnes requests a poll of the absentees. Representative Frederick."

Frederick: "Please record me as 'no'."

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

Representative Terzich, 'aye'. Representative Bradley. Representative Bradley requests permission to be verified. Everybody in your seat, please. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Alexander. Bullock. Casey. Donovan. Ewell. Dwight Friedrich. Gaines. Goodwin. Harris. Klosak. Laurino. Margalus. Molloy."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Pechous."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Donovan desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Richmond. Skinner."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Williamson. And, Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative. Representative Lechowicz, did you...Lechowicz, did you have a request of the Chair? Okay."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Affirmative. Abramson. Anderson. Barnes. Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Bower. Bradley. Brummer. Capparelli. Capuzi. Chapman. Christensen. Collins. Cullerton. Darrow. Davis. Dawson. Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Epton. Farley."

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

Leverenz: "Yes, could we at least have...clear the center aisle so that we can..."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, Representative Piel..."

Leverenz: "...take a peek and see if people are here?"

Speaker Redmond: "...Williams, will you please be seated?
Donovan. Brummer. How about Davis? Does he
interfere with your view?"

Leverenz: "Yes, he's the biggest problem, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "How about Conti?"

Leverenz: "He's all right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien desires to be
verified."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the poll of the Affirmative.

Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Griesheimer.

Grossi. Hallock. Hanahan. Hannig. Henry. Huff.

Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz.

Kosinski. Krska. Kucharski. Kulas. Lechowicz.

Leinenweber. Leon. Madigan. Mahar. Marovitz.

Matijevich. Mautino. McAuliffe. McBroom. McClain.

Meyer. Mulcahey. Murphy. Oblinger. O'Brien.

Patrick. Peters. Piel. Pouncey. Preston. Reilly.

Bonan. Ryan. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Schraeder.

Simms. Skinner. Slape. Stanley. Stearney. E.G.

Steele. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. Tuerk. Van

Duyn. Vitek. VonBoeckman. Walsh. Watson. White.

Wilder. J.J. Wolf. Sam Wolf. Younge. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions of the Affirmative Roll
Call? Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Yeah, what are we starting at, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Ninety-four 'aye'."

Leverenz: "Representative Beatty."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Leverenz: "Beatty."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Beatty on the floor?
How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Remove Representative Beatty."

Leverenz: "Representative Bianco."

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

Leverenz: "Capparelli."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here over in his seat. Representative Simms."

Simms: "Could I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms desires leave to be verified."

Leverenz: "All right."

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

Leverenz: "Dawson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dawson. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Remove Representative Dawson."

Leverenz: "Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Leverenz: "McAuliffe."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Representative Dawson is back in the Chamber. Put him back on."

Leverenz: "Garmisa."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Garmisa here? How is Representative Garmisa recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove Representative Garnisa."

Leverenz: "Representative McBroon."

Speaker Redmond: "He's back there. He's the Gentleman talking to Representative Neff, who's not in his seat."

Leverenz: "Probably having a conference then. Mulcahey."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Mulcahey in the Chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove Representative Mulcahey. Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman requests leave to be verified."

Leverenz: "Representative Reilly."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Leverenz: "Reilly."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Reilly in the chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Leverenz: "Representative Ronan."

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

Murphy: "May I be verified, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "May Representative Murphy be verified? Who was the last one, Representative Leverenz?"

Leverenz: "Ronan."

Speaker Redmond: "Ronan? He's the studious Gentleman there. He's here. Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to be verified, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "May Representative Hannig be verified?"

Leverenz: "Representative Tuerk."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

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

Speaker Redmond: "May Representative Willer be verified? Representative Mulcahey has returned. Put him back on."

Leverenz: "Stearney."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Stearney in the chamber? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Remove Representative Stearney."

Leverenz: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Hanahan in the chamber? How's Representative Hanahan recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Leverenz: "Representative Slape."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Slape. Is Slape in the chamber? Here he is down in front."

Leverenz: "Representative Margalus."

Speaker Redmond: "Margalus? Representative Margalus. Is Margalus here? How's he recorded?"

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

Leverenz: "Not voting."

Clerk O'Brien: "...not voting."

Speaker Redmond: "Don't remove him. Anything further?"

Leverenz: "Mautino."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Mautino...how's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Representative Schoeberlein. Representative Schoeberlein desires to be verified. Is that correct? Representative Schoeberlein...Schoeber...what is your wish? Are you recorded?"

Leverenz: "Leave."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Leverenz: "Go ahead, Al."

~~Speaker Redmond: "May he be recorded...verified, Representative Leverenz?"~~

Leverenz: "Fine."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Anything further?"

Leverenz: "I think that's it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Yourell recorded?"

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

Yourell: "I'm going to vote 'aye' on this Bill, but I'm going to tell you something. When this Bill comes back after the Conference Committee, I don't think the Bill will get 50 votes. And I'll be interested to know what the Sponsor's posture will be after these Amendments, which were good Amendments, were put on the Bill on Second Reading are removed in Conference Committee. And I suggest to you the only reason this Bill is passing out now is so that it can be kept alive so that Amendments can be put to it in Conference Committee. And, that's where the real test

will come on this Bill. And I hope the Sponsor, when she sees those Amendments, will table the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Representative Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."

Leverenz: "J.J. Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "What's that?"

Leverenz: "J.J. Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative J.J. Wolf... Representative J.J. Wolf is in the back there. You had indicated once that you were finished. Now, are you finished or not finished?"

Leverenz: "That was an almost. Now, I am."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Breslin is 'aye'. On this question there are 90 'aye' and 64 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Roman Kosinski, for what purpose do you arise?"

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, would you bring to the attention of the General Assembly something for those interested in law and order that is of great concern. I... may I have these? I quote from this morning's STATE JOURNAL REGISTER. And I read an article in the Al Manning column, in which a Bernice Jackson of Tazewell County, a school teacher who became actively involved in politics after the 1978 legislative pay raise, said, 'Some people are getting so mad they are talking about', and I quote, 'getting guns and going to

Springfield to shoot at Legislators.' Something real bad is going to happen, Jackson warns. This revolves about the people who Monday filed objections to the petitions which called for a referendum on reducing the size of the House of Representatives. Whether this kind of thing applies to Members of the General Assembly...or any other citizen of the State of Illinois, the United States of America, I think it's an...anarchistic attitude, not to be condoned, and I am very concerned."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention what the typical card that I am receiving or the communication from my admirers all over the United States. Now I'm going to have to put a couple of blanks in here because I think it shouldn't be on the floor of the House. Anyway, I receive a lot of this kind of stuff. I just hope John Matijevich is getting his share. He deserves, I suppose. Anyway, 'Dear Sir,' now this is from Chicago so all of you Representatives from Chicago are equally at fault, I think. 'Dear Sir, why you old, F—t..., ' oh, I've got the guts but there's too many women present. 'It's about time women ran the country and fought for it, too. We are more intelligent, healthy, and prettier than men. Thank God for that. You must be shacking up with that big, black..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers, mind your language."

Borchers: "I'm reading a communication from a constituent from Chicago. 'Illinois must be full of corn-balls

like you. This is the typical thing I'm receiving. I hope you get lots of them too."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I got some cards too. One of them said that I ought to have more sense than to where the VFW cap. So somebody thought that I was Weber Borchers. But I've had my disagreements with Phyllis Schlafly but I know she's got more sense than that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, an inquiry of the Chair. I am curious as to what provision of the rules provide for us reading our mail publically on the House floor? Or newspaper articles."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen. Wait a minute. Representative Brummer, what was the..."

Brummer: "I would like to know what the provision in the rules authorizes the occupying time of the House with regards to reading publically newspaper articles or mail on the House floor. What order of business is that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Point of personal privilege. It's kind of elastic. They rose on a point of personal privilege. Until we discovered what the substance of their comment was there was no way we could know whether it was proper or improper."

Brummer: "Okay, now all of us go back and get some mail from our office and read it or quote a newspaper article, the Tribune or Sun Times or something, I'll read some article here. I think we have more important things to do than occupy the time of the House with that."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Gentleman did not hear the gist of Representative Kosinski's remarks in quoting a newspaper article in which a woman named Bernice Jackson said that people were going to get guns and come down to Springfield and do something to Legislators because of a challenge to petitions that were filed with fraudulent signatures. I would like to make note for Mr. Kosinski and for the rest of the Members of the House, it might interest you to know that Ms. Jackson is a candidate for the Illinois Legislature. And we're all looking forward to having her serve with us next year, and Jim Von Boeckman, we're really going to miss you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly, are you ready on 2022? Out of the record. Representative Hoffman, 569, are you ready on that? Senate Bill 569, Representative Gene Hoffman."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 569. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. This Bill has been read a second time previously and held on Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "We were up to Amendment #4, Hoffman, amends Senate Bill 569 as amended by deleting all..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the Bill that we got into last evening very late. And at that particular time we were considering Amendment #3. And at that particular juncture I withdrew the Amendment and withdrew the Bill. And I would like to go back to Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you repeat that, Representative

Hoffman?"

Hoffman: "Yes, I withdrew the Bill...took the Bill out of the record and withdrew Amendment #3 and I would like to back to Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Would you read Amendment 3? You want to go back to 3 and have it considered, is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "When you withdrew it, we tore it up. Really didn't."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Hoffman, amends Senate Bill 569 on page 1, line 1 and so forth."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you remember last evening about ten minutes until twelve, we were considering this Bill. This particular Amendment deletes everything after the enacting clause..."

Speaker Redmond: "Matijevich...proceed."

Hoffman: "...everything after the enacting clause in 569, which was a current funding Bill for special education. Because the Senate did not see fit to include the additional fifty, plus, million dollars for current funding, we are, in its place, putting a legislation which was brought to us by the Chicago School Finance Authority under the direction of Mr. Van Gorkum and the Chicago board. Their interest in the present time due to the increased cost of the sale of the five hundred million dollar bonds, is to provide for an additional twenty-eight million dollars in bonding power to make up for the difference, in terms of the cost of the five hundred million, plus

forty-five million which will net forty million for working cash fund which included in Amendment #4 to make it possible for the the Chicago board in early part of...of 1981, to get over a financial crunch that the auditors say they will have and will not have the resources. That working cash fund must be repaid by the board within eleven months. And the money is to be used...the repayment money is to be used to retire...retire the bonds. So I would ask for your affirmative support for Amendment #3 and then I will go to Amendment #4. 3, increases the bonding authorization from five hundred million to five hundred and seventy-three million."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right, the...Representative Hoffman has moved the adoption of Amendment #3, is that correct? On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Recently...this morning, on House Bill 1812, you said if we voted it out it would probably go to Conference Committee and we wouldn't recognize it. We now have, in Senate Bill 569, a Bill that came to us regarding transportation for handicapped children. Isn't it true that after this Amendment we won't recognize it?"

Hoffman: "It is true that after this Amendment, it will have different cloth."

Schlickman: "What do you anticipate will be put on this Bill in Conference Committee?"

Hoffman: "I don't anticipate this Bill going to Conference

Committee at all."

Schlickman: "I see. You are giving bond authority to the Chicago school district, is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Giving additional bonding authority to the Chicago School Finance Authority, not the school board."

Schlickman: "What is the object of this bonding authority, capital improvements?"

Hoffman: "The object of the bonding authority, as you know from our discussion in January, is for operational expenses to take the Chicago school system out of their disasterous financial problem. Of this ~~additional seventy-three million in this Bill, forty~~ million...or, forty-five million...I should say forty-five million gross, will be used to establish, under the Chicago School Finance Authority, a working cash fund."

Schlickman: "What would be the object...the purposes of the bonding authority, specifically, what would the money be spent for...other than establishing a working cash fund?"

Hoffman: "The...the other twenty-eight million, other than the forty-five million for the working cash fund, twenty-eight million will net out twenty-five because the three million has to be set aside for reserves and bond redemption...would be used for short-term operating expenses."

Schlickman: "What is the term of these bonds?"

Hoffman: "The term of these additional bonds is the same as the terms of the original bonds, which I believe, were thirty years...or, twenty-nine year bonds."

Schlickman: "Thirty year obligation for today's operating

expenses?"

Hoffman: "That's exactly the same purpose for which the five hundred million dollars were agreed to in January. There's no change."

Schlickman: "What is the presenting bonding authority in Chicago...for school purposes?"

Hoffman: "The present bonding authority of the Chicago School Finance Authority is five hundred million."

Schlickman: "May I address myself to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "~~Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the~~ Gentleman who is offering this Amendment has done well over the years to use Bills as vehicles during the last week of the Session to bring about surprises, to meet crisis, to solve problems on an ad hoc basis for the purpose of public education. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that not only should we vote 'no' on this Amendment to frustrate once and for all this vehicle for bringing about surprises, for bringing about ad hoc solutions to crisis. But we should also vote against this because it violates, what I think a very basic principle. And that is, you increase taxes to pay for operating expenses. You issue bonds only for capital improvements. You do encumber future generations for the mistakes of people today. And I would urge a 'nay' vote."

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

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this

Amendment. I would like to address something that the previous Speaker mentioned. And, I would point out that I do not consider this...I do not consider this a vehicle for something that can be used in Conference Committee. There was a school problem...sponsored a meeting for all of the Legislators, I think it was earlier this week, where Mr. Van Gorkum and school board officials and school...the Chicago public school staff came and told us of the...of the difficulties. What's happening is that they need approximately forty-five million dollars in a working cash fund. It was something that they didn't anticipate, but the flux of money that's in the system is enormous. And they found that while, you might, while accounts due are sufficient, there isn't that much working capital in the...in the system so that they can handle, on an even keel, their day to day business. In terms of the other part of the funding, it was indicated that the initial...that the initial bonds...there were a number of problems that they had with the initial five hundred million dollars. They did not...it did not generate as much money because of a number of factors as they thought it would. And the...the bonding authority, not the school district, the bonding authority needed that. The bonding authority has the taxing power and this will be paid, these monies will be paid by the City of Chicago. So it doesn't involve any state money. I would join you, if this comes back in a...if this comes back in another fashion, I would vote against it. But believe me, it is not a vehicle. The...the Finance Authority of the City of...the

school board needs this very, very much. I think the...they are keeping the heels of the board of education at the fire. Mr. Van Gorkum said that in the first six months you must cut sixty million. They have cut that sixty million in expenses. He has set for them another line that they must meet in terms of cuts of the school board. And Mr. Van Gorkum and the School Financing Authority has been very...some people have felt, especially educators, have felt that he has been very tough. But that's fine. And I think what we should do is help Mr. Van Gorkum here in his request and give him the authority to do so. I would ask for your favorable support. And I would also reiterate that I will join you if this comes back as anything other than what it goes out as now. Thank you."

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

Speaker Mulcahey: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Mulcahey: "He indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "Representative Hoffman, are you a Member of the...you know, under Senate Joint Resolution 77, we had a Committee, Joint Senate and House Committee, to look at the Chicago Board of Education picture. Are you a Member of that Committee?"

Hoffman: "Yes, I am a Member of that Committee."

Ebbesen: "Back in February of this year, I sent a letter to the..."

Hoffman: "I'm familiar with the letter to which you refer."

Ebbesen: "Okay. Now, I sent a letter regarding...to the

Auditor General and I sent a copy to Mr. Van Gorkum and his Committee and also a Member of this Senate-House Joint Committee investigating as to what caused the crisis there and who was to blame and so forth. But now, this letter addressed itself to the subject of the delinquent corporate personal property taxes. And, as a Member of the Committee, to this point, what has been done regarding cooperation with the Auditor General, his staff, in seeking out collecting some of these corporate dollars that are delinquent out there?"

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer this question to the Co-Chairman of this Committee, Representative Schneider."

Speaker Mulcahey: "The Chair recognizes. Representative Schneider. Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "We are...Joe, as you know, when you came to me with this informally a month or so ago, we had indicated to you that we had an interest in your question as one of our fundamental areas of concern. So we are, pursuant to the comments that you received from Senator Berman in which he stated that he was dealing with...he had introduced a couple of Bills that might address that issue. But in addition to that, we have yet to complete the hearings. We are, as you must understand, kind of in recess on the hearings because of the Session and we will resume that. I might add in part to the...the question that you raised about this package before you, is that the Finance Authority and the school board did address the Joint Education Committees and the School Problems

Commission recently. They had a very elaborate and substantial package. Many of us thought that, first of all, there were too many unanswered questions from the HJR 73 investigative Committee that did allow us at this time to approve those kinds of issues on such short notice. So I want to assure you, as I'm certain the Senators and the House Members are part of that Committee, that we will pursue your concerns on the corporate personal property tax, as well as evaluate some further suggestions about how to improve the agency, the Finance Authority and the school board so that they can deliver the proper educational program to the children of the City of Chicago. All you're going to be addressing this morning is that increase bonding for seventy-three million dollars, which the Joint Committees that met with the Finance Authority reduced from their regular request of one hundred million dollars. I think we were direct with them. I think we indicated the same kinds of concern that all of you had about whether or not they are living up to the obligation we established for them. So Representative Keane is getting away from you now, but what Representative Keane says is right. The authorization of five million dollars was not adequate because of the cost of money as we went through that high inflationary, high rate period on bonds. And that's why they're back. I think it's a legitimate question. I was concerned as a Cochairman, and I think it's a valid proposal before you. So let me say this in conclusion, that we will try to be of assistance to you. It is a high priority for us. And

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 25, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I will, of course, be in touch with you off and on over the summer and into December."

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

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members..."

Speaker Mulcahey: "Excuse me, Representative Stuffle, back up a little bit. Representative Ebbesen. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to address myself to the Amendment and...for the benefit of the Members of the House, this is a subject on this delinquent corporate personal property tax that...that all of us, especially downstate, are aware of. And I'd just like to cite from an Illinois Property Tax Statistics that came from the Department of Revenue. . If you didn't get your copy this morning, it's on its way. But in talking about the County of Cook, you know, they're much more efficient with the real property tax collections, they get in around 86 to 88 percent. But on these corporate personal property taxes, and this is 1977 year, that they..."

Speaker Mulcahey: "Representative Kulas, on a point of order."

Kulas: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman is not addressing himself to the Amendment. He's talking about corporate property tax, we're talking about authorization for bonding. Let me...curtail his remarks to the Amendment."

Speaker Mulcahey: "Would the Gentleman please confine his remarks to the Amendment."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd be glad to if the Gentleman

will allow me. The point is that 53 1/2 percent of the money that's collected from corporate personal property taxes goes to the schools. And if they...it shows a delinquency in '77 of three hundred and some million dollars. Now if they went out and collected twenty-five or thirty percent of that, they wouldn't be down here asking for an increase for authorization as far as the bonds are concerned to create a working cash fund. That's my whole point. And I couldn't agree more with what Representative Schlickman said. When you're increasing the...the bonding authority for operating expenses and passing that on to future generations, thirty year bonds, for operations...thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's a poor concept. The original five hundred million was probably something we shouldn't have done as far as operating expenses are concerned, using bond money. And for that reason I would encourage a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Hulcahey: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, numerous downstate Representatives from both sides of the aisle have been coming over and questioning what this does, if it affects school aid, if it affects downstate. It doesn't, nor does the next Amendment effect us. I would point out, however, that I think that most people will agree that this part and parcel of the problems that face the whole state. We did recognize last year that the City of Chicago school district had a unique and greater problem than any of the other areas, partly because of it's size, partly because of

mismanagement, partly because, simply, the money wasn't there to keep the schools open. That situation has become even more grave. Efforts have been made in Chicago to clean up the mess, to reduce the budget, to cut the fat, to get rid of the dead weight. I think this is a necessary proposal at this time in this Amendment, and in the next Amendment, to let the city school district continue to help itself and not come down here and ask them directly. No doubt about it, this will be tied up with the rest of the school issue if and when there is an attempt to do something to the agreement that went out of this House with regard to school aid. At this point and time, that is not the case. I can assure you that if it becomes such, that becomes the case, there will be an attempt to stop this and tie the whole thing together, even if it takes a Conference Committee. Downstaters ought to support this at this time. It's taking nothing from us. In fact, it may be helping us in such a way that something isn't taken from us in the future in this Session. And I would urge an affirmative vote on this Amendment and the subsequent Amendment from Representative Hoffman."

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

Gaines: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to oppose the concept of this finance authority in January. I want to say that since you impose this milestone around the necks of the citizens of Chicago, they ought to be adequately funded, otherwise they also will fail."

That's the problem. You downstaters come up with a solution to our Chicago problem and then you underfund it and blame us for it not being successful. So, as one who really doesn't believe in this concept, but since you adopted it in January, I think you have an obligation to properly fund it. So it maybe might work. So, therefore, I'm ask...in support of this Amendment because it's the only way to try to make something you did wrong in January work. Now, in so far as the corporate personal property tax, I've talked to members of the Chicago school board. They are in touch with the Cook County State's Attorney and are urging him to go forward and try to collect the money. We have a new school board so the mismanagement of the past school board is not relevant any longer. We have a new school board. And we feel that since you put this system into effect, you ought to give it a chance to succeed or fail. And because of slide rule boys in January had numb fingers and didn't come up with the right figure, I don't think that the City of Chicago school kids should be penalized."

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

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't understand Mr. Gaines' comments at all. You've got Chairman Huff in the Schools Problems Commission who proposed the Amendment, Chairman Schneider endorsed the Amendment, both are downstaters. Larry Stuffle from Charleston has been getting up saying he supports it. I,

likewise, join the three of them in supporting this Amendment. So, Charlie, it's not necessary a Chicago versus downstate issue. We recognize you have some problems. We think you have guts because you're trying to cure your problems by yourselves. We want to give your new school board some room so that you have some opportunity to clear it up. And I, along with the other Gentlemen and women on this floor, stand in support of this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Van Duyne has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'no'. And, the main question is put. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman, to close, I believe."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the discussion on the Bill, I think, has...the Amendment has clarified it and I would ask for your affirmative vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hoffman has moved the adoption of the Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 569. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed by saying 'no'. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh, to explain his vote. One minute."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, far less than a year ago we were asked to come down

here to solve a problem dealing with the Chicago Board of Education. And in our wisdom we created the Chicago School Finance Authority and granted them the authority to issue five hundred million dollars in bonds which were for operating and for paying past expenses. Now comes the Chicago Board of Education asking for seventy-three million dollars more in bonding authority because we didn't give them enough at that time. And they suggest that the cost...the cost of issuing those bonds accounts for a great part of this seventy-three million dollars. Now I wonder if they thought at the time that there weren't going to be any costs in issuing these bonds. That's preposterous, Mr. Speaker. A year or so ago, we abolished, at the wish of the Chicago Board of Education, the working cash fund."

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

Walsh: "You haven't got the timer on do you, Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "I've got one right here."

Walsh: "Oh, okay, another minute or so I'll be through. That forty million dollars was abolished so that they could then put that money into operations. Now we are asked to restore the forty million dollars, but not for the Chicago Board of Education but for the new agency dealing with the Chicago schools, the Chicago School Finance Authority. That's a disguise, Mr. Speaker. We're giving forty million dollars in working cash to the Chicago Board of Education and we just abolished it a year ago. Mr. Speaker, the state is not seriously involved in digging the Chicago Board

of Education out of their financial mess but if we keep doing things like this the state is going to be very, very, much involved. And I urge you to vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman, asks for a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Abramson. Bianco. Birchler. Dawson. Donovan. Ralph Dunn. Ewell. Flinn. Hannig. Harris. Huskey. Kane."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do you rise?"

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, change my 'aye' to 'no', please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Change Lechowicz from 'aye' to 'no'. Continue with the poll."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kelly. Laurino. Leverenz. Pechous. Richmond. Ropp. Slape. Telcser. Winchester. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly, 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Domico...Domico, from 'aye'...no..to 'no'. Domico, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "From 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Abramson, 'no'. Could we have the count, Mr. Clerk? Wait just a minute, there's one more from the coalition. Capparelli, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "From 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "73 'ayes', 79 'noes' and the...just one

moment. Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have a polling of the negative and I intend to verify if that prevails."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right, there's been a request for a poll of the negative. The motion fails. Now there's a request for a poll of the prevailing vote, which is the negative vote. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz, for what purpose do you rise? Leverenz."

Leverenz: "On the American Express Card record me as 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record...record Leverenz 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huskey, 'no'. O'Brien, 'no'. Bullock, do you persist yet? Bullock persists on a verification. The Clerk will read the negative vote. Ladies and Gentlemen, remain in your seats, there's a verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Ackerman. Barnes. Bell. Birkinbine. Borchers. Boucek. Bower. Burnidge. Campbell."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ray Ewell, for what purpose do you rise?"

Ewell: "Record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record Ewell as 'aye'. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Capparelli. Capuzi. Casey. Catania. Christensen. Conti. Daniels. Davis. Deuster. Domico. John Dunn. Dyer. Ebbesen. Ewing. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Johnson. Karpel. Kent. Klosak. Kucharski. Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Leverenz. Macdonald. Mahar."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The coalition may have worked something out. Record Capparelli to...from 'no' to 'aye'. How's Domico? Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Matula. Mautino. McAuliffe. McBroom. McMaster."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Bower. Leave to be verified? Leave. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mulcahey. Neff. Oblinger. O'Brien. Peters. Piel."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. J.J. Wolf, from 'no' to 'aye'. What...just slowly so the Clerk can get it. Domico, from 'no' to 'aye'. Dawson, 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bianco, did you want recognition. No, I thought...oh. Lechowicz. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I had the wrong Amendment. Kindly record me from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Return Lechowicz back from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Hannig, 'aye'. Do you have all those, Clerk? Hannig, 'aye'. He's already back. He started it. Flinn, 'aye'. Monroe Flinn, 'aye'. Continue, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Polk. Pullen. Reed. Reilly. Rigney. Robbins. Ryan. Satterthwaite. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Schunemaa. Simms. Skinner. Stanley. Stearney. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Sumner. Swanstrom. Totten. Tuerk. Van Duyn. Vinson. Walsh. Watson. Wikoff. Willer. And, Woodyard."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right, Mr. Clerk, could we have the count before we take questions? 81 'ayes' and 78

'noes'. Now, 81 'ayes' and 78 'noes'. And now, who's going to...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the 'aye' votes are in the affirmative, I temporarily withdraw my request of the...in anticipation of a possible verification of the Affirmative votes if that prevails."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. Oh, yes, he can do that."

Bullock: "...I would commence my verification of the prevailing side in the event that it would be...negative call."

Speaker Matijevich: "He can do that because we haven't got into any...not yet verified a vote. Now the count shows that the...the 'ayes' are the prevailing side. And the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman, asks for a verification of the Affirmative vote. No...no...I mean, you're on the right side. I...I know somebody is going to ask for it, Walsh or Schlickman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker, I would just remind everyone who's on either side of this issue that the Amendments are adopted, that I'm going to need a hundred...a motion which will require 107 votes."

Speaker Matijevich: "I don't think you will. Oh, yeah, that's right, you will."

Hoffman: "I will need a motion for 107 votes to pass this Bill. Now everyone has to do whatever they have to do, but that is ahead of me and I'm thinking in terms of time of the House."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. The Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Verification of the Affirmative, please."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. The Clerk will call out the affirmative votes. Remain in your seats."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Anderson. Balanoff. Beatty. Bluthardt. Bowman. Bradley."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, would ask the persons that are in the center aisle to disperse? And could you also ask the Members if they would raise their hands when their names are called, please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. Could the...could the people in the center aisle, people like Marovitz and Daniels, disperse and clear the aisle. And those Members, when your name is called, raise your right arm and swear that Schlickman can see you. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Braun. Breslin. Bullock. Capparelli. Chapman. Collins. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Henry. Hoffman. Huff. Jaffe. Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Madigan. Margalus. Marovitz. Matijevich. McClain. McCourt. McGrew."

Schlickman: "McGrew asked to be verified, Mr. Speaker, and it's okay with us."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave. Leave for Kosinski and Kornowicz to be verified. Leave, Kosinski and Kornowicz. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "McPike. Meyer. Molloy. Mugalian. Murphy. Patrick. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Ronan. Sandquist. Schisler. Schneider. Schraeder. Sharp. Steczko. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Vitek. VonBoeckman. White. Williamson. J.J. Wolf. Sam Wolf. And, Younge."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman, on..."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, what is the count at this time?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Could we have the count now? 81 'ayes' and 78 'noes'. And, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman on that."

Schlickman: "Representative Alexander."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative who?"

Schlickman: "Alexander."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ethel Alexander. She's in her seat."

Schlickman: "Representative Don Anderson."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative who?"

Schlickman: "Don Anderson."

Speaker Matijevich: "Don Anderson. He's standing near his seat. Proceed."

Schlickman: "Representative John Beatty."

Speaker Matijevich: "John Beatty is standing near his seat."

Schlickman: "Representative Bradley."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Gerald Bradley. I don't see him here. How's Mr. Bradley recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove Bradley."

Schlickman: "Representative Braun."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Braun is by her seat."

Schlickman: "Representative Currie."

Speaker Matijevich: "Currie is in the aisle."

Schlickman: "Representative Dawson."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Dawson. He's in his seat, I'm sorry."

Schlickman: "Representative Doyle."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Doyle is in his seat."

Schlickman: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Matijevich: "Farley is still here."

Schlickman: "He's still here?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes."

~~Schlickman: "Representative Garmisa."~~

Speaker Matijevich: "Garmisa. How's he recorded? He'll be here. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him. Garmisa is removed."

Schlickman: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Krska, leave to be verified? Leave. Hanahan is here."

Schlickman: "Who do you want..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Krska. He's right down here. And Leverenz, leave to be verified? No. Oh, I'm sorry. Just a minute. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz, for what purpose do you rise?"

Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded 'aye' and verified."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record Leverenz as 'aye' and leave to be verified. Leave. Proceed."

Schlickman: "Representative Meyer."

Speaker Matijevich: "Ted Meyer. Way in the back."

Schlickman: "Representative Molloy."

Speaker Matijevich: "Molloy. Vince Molloy. I don't see Vince. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him. Representative Hallstrom, for what purpose do you rise?"

Hallstrom: "'No', Sir."

Speaker Matijevich: "No, no...Representative Huskey, 'aye'. Huskey, 'aye'. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Change my vote from 'aye' to 'no', please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Bluthardt, from 'aye' to 'no'. And, return Garmisa to the Roll. Garmisa is here."

Schlickman: "Representative Mugalian."

Speaker Matijevich: "Mugalian is in his seat."

Schlickman: "Representative Murphy."

Speaker Matijevich: "Murphy. Laz Murphy. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him. Murphy is removed."

Schlickman: "Representative Pierce. I see him."

Speaker Matijevich: "Pierce is in his seat."

Schlickman: "Representative Rea...oh, I see him. Representative Ronan."

Speaker Matijevich: "Ronan. Al Ronan. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Schlickman: "Representative McPike."

Speaker Matijevich: "Jim McPike is...up in the gallery. Where? I don't see him. Oh, he's on his way down. Remove him for the time being. McPike is... Ben Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, Myron Kulas and I have been called down to second floor. Could we both be verified?"

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. Polk and Kulas, both verified. McPike. Return McPike."

Schlickman: "Representative Schisler."

Speaker Matijevich: "Schisler, you back there? I don't see him. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him. Just a moment. Ralph Dunn wishes to be recorded as 'no'. Proceed."

Schlickman: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Matijevich: "Stuffle. I don't see him. How is Representative Stuffle recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Schlickman: "Representative Taylor."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Taylor. I'll be slow. How's Representative Taylor recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Put Stuffle back on the Roll Call. How's Representative Taylor...recorded as 'aye' and I don't see him in the Chamber. Remove him. Taylor."

Schlickman: "Representative VonBoeckman."

Speaker Matijevich: "VonBoeckman. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "I don't see him. Remove VonBoeckman."

Schlickman: "Representative Sam Wolf."

Speaker Matijevich: "Sam Wolf is standing by his seat."

Schlickman: "What is the count now, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "75 'ayes' and 79 'noes'. Return Taylor. 75...76 'ayes' and 79 'noes'."

Schlickman: "I have no other questions. You can..."

Speaker Matijevich: "No other questions. Representative McCourt...MCCourt. Is that 'no'? 'No'. 'Aye' to 'no', right, McCourt? Right. Richmond. Was that Richmond that wanted attention? Did you want attention, Bruce. Richmond, 'aye'. Birchler, 'aye'. Any other changes before we go? Mr. Slape."

Slape: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

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

Slape: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Slape, 'aye'. Is there any other changes before we go into...Madigan, leave to be verified? Leave. Now what is the count, Mr. Clerk. 78 'ayes' and 80 'noes'. And now the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bullock, requests a verification of the negative vote. No we haven't. We have not. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative...the Gentleman from Cook."

Schlickman: "I understand the Affirmative has now been conclusively verified. Period, that's it, correct?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Right."

Schlickman: "No additions hereafter."

Speaker Matijevich: "No, wait a minute. At the end of a vote anybody can change, anybody on both sides can change before the vote is announced. All right. Just a minute. Harris. Harris, 'aye'. Ann Willer."

Willer: "Mr. Speaker, change me from 'no' to 'yes'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Ann Willer, from 'no' to 'aye'. Winchester. Winchester, 'no'. Could we have a count now? Just one moment. Ropp, 'no'? Ropp, 'no'. Leave for Flinn to be verified 'aye'. Williams. Jack

Williams, 'aye'. Could we have a count now, Mr. Clerk. 81 'ayes'...one moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pechous. You're the one to do it. 81 'ayes', 81 'noes'. Representative Pechous, 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Record me 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "As 'no'. The Gentleman from LaSalle, Anderson, 'no'. This is nip and this is tuck. Now could we have a count, Mr. Clerk. One moment. Return Ronan back to the Roll. And return Schisler back to the Roll. And somebody has ordered some food from that young Gentleman in the...in the aisle over here. Yes, Mr. Clerk. 82 'ayes' and 83 'noes'. And the Gentleman from Cook...no...you've got to verify the negative, Bullock, I think. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, a moment ago I thought I heard Mr...Representative Huskey going from 'nay' to 'aye'. Is he here?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Huskey?"

Schlickman: "Yes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Mr. Huskey. Is that Huskey back there? No. How's he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman went from nonvoting to 'no' and then from 'no' to 'aye'."

Schlickman: "I don't see him, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "I...we completed your verification."

Schlickman: "Yeah, but you've undone that, Mr. Speaker, by asking people..."

Speaker Matijevich: "No we didn't. No we didn't."

Schlickman: "If they wanted to reconsider their vote...and I did not see Mr. Huskey and he's not here."

Speaker Matijevich: "We...well, I think if Mr. Huskey were on the floor when you said your verification is complete, he is then authorized to leave, as far as I'm concerned and as far as the Chair is."

Schlickman: "He was never verified. I never called his name. And I didn't see him when..."

Speaker Matijevich: "You said you were complete with your verification. That's what I'm..."

Schlickman: "And then after that I heard him being recorded ~~'aye' and I did not see him.~~"

Speaker Matijevich: "Well you had already completed your verification though, and I think that's it. Now the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock, requests a verification of the negative vote."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could you give me the count, Mr. Clerk?"

Speaker Matijevich: "I think it's the same as I just said."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, could you repeat it, I didn't hear you?"

Speaker Matijevich: "We'll give it to you. 82 'ayes' and 83 'noes'. And, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose now we're going to a second verification of the negative and I suppose then we can request another verification of the Affirmative. Why don't we just recess for a half an hour until all of the votes get here and then we can take another Roll Call. This is silly..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Jack...Jack, the Chair is really being

fair because what we did was, when Bullock was going to verify, people jumped on and the 'ayes' became the prevailing side. The...Representative Schlickman was through with this verification and now we are returning to Representative Bullock for his verification. So I think it's fair. Let's just proceed with it. Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Ackerman."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ackerman. He's in his seat."

Bullock: "Representative Capuzi."

Speaker Matijevich: "He's in his seat. Proceed."

Bullock: "Representative Conti."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Conti. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him. Continue, Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Representative Grossi."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Grossi. He's in his seat."

Bullock: "Representative Ewing."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Tom Ewing. Is Ewing...I don't see Ewing in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him. Proceed, Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Representative McBroom."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McBroom is in his seat."

Bullock: "Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leverenz is in his seat. Proceed. Oh, I guess he's recorded 'aye', that's right. So...he's in his seat anyway. Proceed."

Bullock: "Representative Mulcahey."

Speaker Matijevich: "Mulcahey. He was just here. Where did he go? Representative Mulcahey. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him. McAuliffe, for what purpose do you rise?"

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, can Representative Stearney and I be verified?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave for Stearney and McAuliffe to be verified? Leave. Proceed, Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Satterthwaite."

Speaker Matijevich: "Mrs. Satterthwaite. She's in her seat."

Bullock: "Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Dan O'Brien is in his seat."

Bullock: "Representative Reilly."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Reilly is in his seat."

Bullock: "Representative..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Return Mulcahey...over on the side here. Return Mulcahey. Oh, one moment. Return Las Murphy as as 'aye'. Return Murphy 'aye'. Proceed. Dave Jones. One moment. Dave Jones, 'aye' to 'no'. Return Molloy to 'aye'? Molloy, 'aye'. Proceed."

Bullock: "Representative E.G. Steele."

Speaker Matijevich: "Everett Steele is in the middle aisle."

Bianco, for what purpose do you rise? Bianco."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "How is Bianco recorded?"

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

Bianco: "Please record me as 'aye'. And could I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave for Bianco to be verified 'aye'? Leave."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, could you give me the total?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Could we have the count, Mr. Clerk? The Gentleman from Cook, what purpose do you rise?"

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if he's asking for the total, does that indicate that he has completed his verification of the negative?"

Speaker Matijevich: "I guess he wants the count."

Walsh: "Well...no, no. He's not entitled to a count until the verification is completed."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right, let's just proceed. Bullock, continue."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I was merely trying to save time of the House. There's been many people going through the revolving door and I didn't want to persist with verifications if the outcome was rather obvious and I was going to temporarily stop. But I'll persist."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. Proceed."

Bullock: "Representative Van Duyne."

Speaker Matijevich: "How's Van Duyne recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him. Proceed. Speaker, 'aye'. Proceed."

Bullock: "Representative McMasters."

Speaker Matijevich: "McMaster is in his seat."

Bullock: "Representative Margalus."

Speaker Matijevich: "Margalus. He's back there, way in the back. Proceed."

Bullock: "I meant Matula, I'm sorry."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Matula. I don't see...oh, here he is. Matula is over in the middle here."

Bullock: "Where is he?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Right over here in Lee Daniels' seat. Proceed."

Bullock: "Representative Daniels. Is he around?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He's in..."

Bullock: "He's on the right side of the aisle, okay."

Speaker Matijevich: "Let's keep him over there. Okay. One moment. O'Brien, for what purpose do you rise? Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Change my vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Change O'Brien to 'aye'. Did George Call you. Proceed."

Bullock: "I have no other verifications at this time."

Speaker Matijevich: "No other verifications. The Clerk will give us the count. Huskey, for what purpose do you arise?"

Huskey: "How do you have me recorded, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "You're recorded as 'aye'."

Huskey: "Vote me 'no', Mr. Speaker. I've seen the error of my ways."

Speaker Matijevich: "Huskey, 'no'. Could we have the count now? One moment. Mr. Brummer, for what purpose do you rise?"

Brummer: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record Brummer as 'aye'. Telcser, 'no'. Ewing, 'no'. Ewing, 'no'. The Clerk will give me the count. On this motion there are 86 'ayes', 83 'noes' and the Amendment is adopted. And now, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber. Would the Parliamentarian come around?"

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I have filed a document with the Clerk before you move this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Would the Clerk read the motion?"

Clerk O'Brien: "I demand pursuant to House Rule 34 d that House Bill 569 be returned to the Order of Second Reading...Senate Bill 569 be returned to the Order of Second Reading, 1st Legislative Day. Representative Leinenweber."

Speaker Matijevich: "On that, the Chair is going to look at the Amendment and the motion and we'll get back...and the Bill. We're going to do it right now so stay in your seat, Harry. Are there further Amendments? One moment. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to take this Bill out of the record."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gene, do you want to come up here before you do that? Come on up here. We're going to dispose of this first. All right. The Gentleman from DuPage, requests that this Bill be taken out of the record. We will come back to this motion by Representative Leinenweber...his request, after the Bill is back in the record."

Leinenweber: "Will that be next week, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "It may be, and it may be later today.
Senate Bill 1524."

Clerk Leone: "A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code.
Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 4 were
adopted previously."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are there any motions? Are those
Committee Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Number 1 was a Committee Amendment. Number 4
was a Floor Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, Daniels-Kosinski. Amends
~~Senate Bill 1524~~ in the title and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage,
Representative Daniels on Amendment #5."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
how many of you have read in the paper..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. For what purpose does the
Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly, rise?"

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the Sponsor is going to proceed
with the Amendment, I'd like to challenge the
germaneness of the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Kelly, has asked for a ruling on
germaneness on Amendment #5. The Chair rules the
Amendment is germane. Proceed, Representative
Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
the Amendment before you deals with the Habitual
Offender Act. How many of you have read, lately, the
number of rapes that have been committed in the City
of Chicago and throughout the State of Illinois? How

many of you have gone through the problems dealing with Class X, and how many of you have said to yourself or heard from your constituents, 'Why...Why haven't these people been put in jail and why aren't they kept there where they belong'? Well, an editorial appeared in the Sun Times on June 7, 1980 entitled, "Slam the Door on Rapists". And in that editorial appeared an article which referred to three cases in the City of Chicago naming those individuals. One appeared in Mike Royko's column entitled, "One Man Crime Wave", involving a fellow who constantly was appearing at Chicago Circle Campus and had been convicted of three felonious actions previously and yet was being released from prison. The second story was another gentleman who appeared and was a feature article in Chicago Magazine. The same thing happened in that case. Convicted of several Class X felonies and yet free to roam the streets. And the last reference was to another gentleman who was also convicted of felonies now charged with rape who was let free. The Amendment that you have before you, the Habitual Offenders Act, is a result of the enactment of that legislation back in 1978, effective at that date, which referred to the date of the effectiveness of the last conviction of felony. The Amendment which you have changes that law in three ways. One, it expands the list of triggering offenses. That is, it adds to the offenses that can be calculated for a mandatory life imprisonment by referring to all Class X offenses. Those offenses that this Legislature determines to be the offenses that will be classified

as Class X. Secondly, it permits reliance upon prior crimes from other jurisdictions if they contain the same elements as the Class X offenses in Illinois presently contained. And thirdly, and most importantly, it allows a retrospective reliance upon convictions which occurred before the Act's passage. A retrospective reliance means that as long as the last felony Class X occurs after the effective date of the original legislation that is after February 1, 1978 that it would fall under the Habitual Offenders Act. If this law were in effect today, the three instances that were cited in the editorial of the Sun Times would not be allowed to occur today and those people would be incarcerated in the penitentiary. Now, we're not talking about people that have done things that are not classified as Class X crimes. We're not talking about individuals that are not felons or convicted felons. We're talking about hard core Class X felonious activity. We're talking about the most heinous crimes that our society knows today. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an emergency piece of legislation. This was brought to our attention by the editorial in the Sun Times. Governor Thompson is supporting this legislation and through the years of effort by Representative Kosinski, we are able to bring this Amendment to your attention now. I solicit, I urge your favorable support of this very, very important Amendment to close this loophole in the law. This is perhaps the most important piece of criminal legislation to address the General Assembly during this Session."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 25, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1524. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, sometime after midnight I had occasion to talk about this Amendment. At that time, I told you that what the Sponsor proposed to do was within the space of 24 hours to give birth to a whole new law. Forgetting all about filing your Bills on time and these little nonsensical things about the right of the public to be heard before committee, the right of people to be able to know what's going on. That they were proposing to come in and in less than 24 hours they were going to pass a law. Now it wasn't the law that was a simple, little, irrelevant law relating to this or that mind or matter. It was a law that would determine whether and under what circumstances an individual would be confined to prison for the rest of that person's natural life. It is, to me, shocking as much as I've seen this and for so many years it is still shocking to see a Member rise on the floor of this House, dispense with the constitutional requirements that Bills be read a third time...three times in each House and propose that zip, zip, zip we will pass a new law today, and we will worry about it for the next few years. This is a very shocking procedure. We should not be hardened to it. We should try to do something about improving the way we operate, and these people who are fond of rising and saying how good the Legislature is ought to take a look at this kind of

procedure under which now it is now one o'clock and they propose, in less than 12 hours, to go from nothing at all to a total new law. I say it is a terrible procedure. There is no reason for it. This problem has been with us for months and months and years and years as other speakers will tell you. The problem is already taken care of. The Member who raised this question now could have filed a Bill earlier. I'm glad to see that he reads newspaper editorials. He knew about this problem before, but he did not want to give everybody a fair chance to be heard. He didn't want this to go before a committee. He wanted to slam it through at the last minute in violation of every sound rule of legislative procedure. He shouldn't have a different rule than the rest of us. We file our Bills on time and they go to committees. This ought to be soundly rejected."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, as I started to say last night and as Representative Greiman said last week, the...the hope of all of us who seek immortality should be to be reincarnated as a Bill in the General Assembly. Representative Daniels has not sponsored this before. This is his first shot at it. I hope the last. This is the tenth or twelfth time in the four years that I've been here that we've heard this Bill. We already have a three-time loser Bill in Illinois. Now, the Class X sentencing reform says that with a commission of three offenses that is specified under that Act, you have a natural life sentence. We

already have a Class X reform that includes the things that Representative Daniels and the newspapers have indicated are important. But what's dangerous about this Bill is the ramifications for due process under the Constitution. And I realize that's not always a guideline and it's not really our determination or our role here to determine the constitutionality of Bills, but I think it's important to point out what this Bill could do. What this Bill says is, you go back 20 years plus any time of incarcerations. You could go back as much as 30 or 40 years to the 1940's and 1950's and any time prior to 1978 and an individual has two crimes that are committed that are now classified or at any time in the future classif as Class X even though at the time he, or she committed those offenses they didn't know about this Act because it didn't existed...didn't exist, we go back and use those prior offenses and the minute you commit one offense that the Legislature in its wisdom classifies as Class X after the effective date of the act, you throw away the key. You throw away the key notwithstanding that we've got prisons that are already vastly overcrowded, that we just had to release three or four hundred prisoners by the...by Executive order because the prisons can't keep up with them, that we have a problem with funding out penal system that notwithstanding the fact that the Legislature, at any time in the future, can make anything Class X. I say it's likely, in light of what we've done in the past, that we'd classify burglary as Class X in 1984. And you go back to 1951 and 1961 and

in individual committed a burglary, let's say '61 and '63, and then we use those two prior offenses against them. The minute he commits the third offense in 1984 we reclassify his Class X. You throw away the key. Representative Cullerton discussed the really unfairness of our armed violence statute that basically says if you go in and commit a shoplifting offense with a three inch or greater knife in your back pocket, it's a Class X felony and you throw away the key under this Act as long as there are two previous offenses committed. It's a retroactive Bill. I remember back in our civics classes in high school and college the one thing we always talked about that this country was founded and in our Anglo-American system of law was founded on is the Ex Post Facto Law that says you can classify crimes or offenses for the future, and you people notice what we're going to do if they violate the criminal laws of the state. And I fully support a three-time loser Bill as long as it's...as long as it's prospective. But an Ex Post Facto Law also says you can't go back to the past and dredge up those past offenses that at the time weren't classified as something and then reclassify them and throw away the key. Don't let the people put this over as a law and order bill. The practical effect of this is going to be is that you're going to reduce convictions, that you're going to overcrowd the prisons if it works to the contrary and that you're going to violate everybody's constitutional rights. It's not a law and order Bill. I'd yield to nobody in terms of my record of support

for good and law and order legislation in this Legislature. I've sponsored and passed a good many Bills that would toughen the criminal justice system, but you don't do that by violating peoples individual rights. You don't that by looking to the past. You do that by looking to the future with good, sound legislation. And that isn't what this does. This Bill ought to have the same fate that it's had the last ten or twelve times that it's been brought up, and that is to defeat it soundly and I urge a no vote."

Speaker Matijeich: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly. One moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Henry, for what purpose do you rise?"

Henry: "Mr. Speaker, I was rising to speak in favor of the Amendment. I can yield to Mr. Kelly."

Speaker Matijeich: "Alright. Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Henry and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I...I've done some serious soul searching on whether or not to support this Amendment #5. I had a long record of voting and supporting law and order issues and I...and I'm very concerned over whether or not we should move forward with this issue, because last night, as you know, we were able to adopt Amendment #4 to this Bill which was the pro-life Amendment that actually extended equal protection to the unborn against convicted murderers. Now, at the last minute, the Sponsor comes in with a very comprehensive Amendment and a...and a proposal which has had more than adequate debate in this House of Representatives, not only during this Session, but

when it passed out of here two years ago, to change the entire legislation around from...from providing benefits to the unborn to now going to be a three-time loser Bill. Well, I' going to oppose Amendment #5. I told you last week that abortion is my number one priority, has been, will continue to be. I know that the number of pro-life persons have been lobbying for Amendment #4 and not favoring a change because they felt this definition was very well needed in the statutes in the State of Illinois. I intend to vote opposed to Representative Daniels Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from St. Clair, Miss Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you...Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Amendment. I think it's one of the more important Amendments that we will be considering during this Session. Everyone in this House has witnessed the shocking increase in crime in every city and every village in this state yet we have seen that some of these crimes are particularly brutal and the perpetrators of these crimes, after conviction, are sent to jail, serve a few years, and they are out to prey on the public again. And this has happened time after time after time. If we are ever to do anything to make our streets safe, to prevent the serious crime of heinous rape that goes on in every major city in this state, an Amendment such as this is absolutely necessary. Many of these people are hardened criminals and yet they commit the same crime time after time after time after time. It's about time that we have a three times and you're out law.

Although I know that we do have one presently in existence, it is not...is not retroactive. That's all this Amendment will do. I think it's very important to the people of this state and I would ask for an affirmative vote."

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

Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Johnson said very clearly why this is a really terrible Amendment. I'm going to repeat that. I'm surprised that anyone would applaud our society passing Ex Post Facto laws as the previous speaker has just done. It goes against everything our country stands for. I would point out something else however. Our country, United States, and Russia, and South America have the highest, largest number of people incarcerated in prisons. The rest of the European nations have much lower numbers of people in prisons and a much lower crime rate. I wonder when we're going to stop and think instead of pandering to the emotions and fears of our constituents, when we're going to stop and think why crime continues to rise. We have created so many laws, punitive laws, really strict laws just since I've been here since 1975 against the very crimes of violence, heinous crimes we are now talking about and they continue to rise. Rape continues to go up. It's not just better reporting. I believe the crime is going up. Do you really think this is going to stop the type of rapists we're talking about. It's not going to stop him one bit and we know it. We want to take this law. We want to vote for it and go back to our voters and fool them

and say, 'Hey, we've done something'. We haven't done anything. This is not a law and order Bill. This is a law and disorder Bill. It will just create more disorder within our criminal justice system without addressing ourselves to the real, really basic reasons of why rape is on the increase, why crimes of violence are on the increase. We know part of the answers. We refuse to do anything about it because it's too difficult. This is the easy way for a Legislator running for re-election to go back home and say, 'Well, we've made the streets safe for you. We...another category of crime'. We're now into praising Ex Post Facto laws, no less, in our society. This is a shame. It's a travesty on the justice we're supposed to love and have our allegiance go to. And I think...I urge a 'no' vote on this."

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

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I did speak on this last night. The Sponsor then took it out of the record. It's called the three-time-loser Bill. Perhaps it should be called the twelve or thirteen or fourteen-time-loser Bill because that's how many times this Bill has lost, I understand, in the General Assembly. The reason why we have rejected it is because the way it would work, for those of you who are not that familiar with criminal, if someone has been convicted of two crimes and now he's up in front of a judge for a third charge, that judge knows, as a result of this Bill passing, that he has no discretion. If he's found guilty, then he must get life imprisonment. Now if

the judge doesn't want to give someone life imprisonment, but rather he wants to give them 60 years, which is what is available to them right now, he's going to find that person either not guilty or guilty of another offense, a lesser offense. That's why this Bill will result in fewer convictions. That's why it's a bad Bill. There's a number of other reasons, but the main reason, I think, that we have to consider is because it will result in fewer convictions. Now, the heinous, hard-core criminals that Representative Daniels referred to could be, could be a shoplifter. Believe it or not, a shoplifter of something over \$150 with a three-inch knife that happens to be, let's say, in a woman's purse that person is now guilty of a Class X felony called armed violence. And he wants to, in this Bill, expand the three-time-loser Bill that we have now and include that type of heinous, hard-core behavior. It's a very bad Amendment. I'd appreciate it if you vote 'no'."

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

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise first to commend Representative Daniels for this good measure, for his willingness to offer this Amendment. And I rise, also, to deplore what has been said by the opponents of this Amendment. One Gentleman suggested that, because of the right to life for the unborn, this Amendment ought to be rejected. Well, I ask the Members of this House what reason is there to have a right to life for the unborn if they have no right to life after they've been born? And

that's what this Bill is designed to deal with. One previous Member of this House suggested that...in speaking on this Bill, that the Judiciary II Committee had not conducted a hearing on the Bill and that the Sponsor ought to bring it before the Judiciary II Committee. Well, that is a Committee that's never conducted a fair hearing on any Bill designed to deal with improving law enforcement and tightening up the criminal laws of the state. That's the Committee which meets solely for the purpose of allowing the lawyer legislator Members of the Committee to ~~frustrate the will of the people of this state to have~~ a safe society. Like the Chancery Court of England in the 19th century that Dickens described. There's very little hope when you take a Bill or a just cause before that Committee that it will pass before the person who needs the protection has died. On the merits of the Bill I suggest we look at that for a second. Somebody suggested that we already have an adequate three-time-loser provision in Illinois law. Well, what this does is to add a few more crimes. Home invasion, hard drug sales. Who can suggest that on the subject of hard drug sales that a three-time-loser provision is not appropriate? Do we continue to want the heroin peddlers to be released by the court to go back out on the streets? Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this Bill comes down to the question, a very simple question of whether you want law and order in this state, whether you want to lock up the criminals and throw away the keys when they have proven that they can't be rehabilitated.

This isn't for the simple criminal who we have some hope of changing. This is for hard-core, syndicate-type crime member who is going back out there time after time after time to violate the law, to threaten the safety of the people of this state. This is the clearest example we've had this year of an opportunity to vote for law and order, and I would urge an 'aye' vote for the Gentleman's Amendment."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Question's on the adoption... Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski, to close the debate."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am a pro-lifer. With respect to Mr. Kelly's concern House Bill 3314, which moved out of this House, is now on Postponed Consideration in the Senate and can be amended with Mr. Kelly's consideration. That way Mr. Kelly can have his cake and eat it too by being in accord with what we're intending to do in terms of law and order and doing what he's attempting to do on pro-life. I respect the opinions of all the previous speakers, but if I can have your attention, the bottom line of this issue is the people. The people of my district, the people of your district, the people of the State of Illinois who are fed up with a revolving-door system of criminal justice. They plead for protection on the streets and we deny them that protection. Rape, robbery, home invasion, deviate sexual assault, hard drug sales, and it appears after each release from prison the next

apprehension is on a more heinous felony. In multiple rapes, the final Act can incorporate murder. How long do we put up with these people? The murder which ends up with young girls bodies being found in forest preserves. In armed robbery, the act of destroying the victim witness has become a daily occurrence. You read about it everyday. Editorials have condemned us for not acting on this matter. There is case history supporting our actions for our people, our women, all of us who are afraid to walk our streets. I ask that you protect us from the habitual criminal and vote yes for this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Question's on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor will signify by voting aye, opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Henry, to explain his vote."

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm from an area of very, very high crime, and I'm saying to you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we needed a deterrent against hard, violent crime. The rate of crime against seniors has risen astronomical numbers. The same is true for young children."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Gentleman...What purpose Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber rise?"

Leinenweber: "Before you move this Bill, I would also demand on this Bill, pursuant to Supreme Court rule 34D, that this Bill be returned to the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day."

Speaker Bradley: "Just one minute please. Could we wait

until we get all the Amendments on and get it in that shape and make that ruling? 87-52 and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, Marovitz-Daniels. Amends Senate Bill 1524..."

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

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This next Amendment reacts to a true emergency, perhaps one of the most imminent emergencies that we've had this Session. Last Friday, June 20, 1980 the United States Supreme Court struck down Illinois residential picketing statute which said that we could not picket at a place of residence, which obviously affects all of us here on the House floor as well as many citizens across the state. They could not picket on residences for our stands, hypothetically, on ERA, busing, or abortions. Supreme Court held that...that the law, as it was stated, violated the equal protection clause of the fourteenth Amendment and the first Amendment on its face by making an impermissible distinction between picketing for peaceful labor disputes and other forms of peaceful picketing. Unless this Section is amended, which we are trying to do here by Amendment 6, or some violent or disturbing act takes place during a residential picketing situation, the law enforcement authorities cannot legally prohibit residential picketing as they have continually done up until the time that our law was declared unconstitutional. What we have done by Amendment #6 is to take away the Section of our law...of our statutes that the courts

found discriminatory, and that was the labor exemption for...for labor picketing, for labor disputes at a residence. The Section that is amended deals only with residential picketing, and the Amendment would only eliminate the sole exemption for picketing of labor disputes at a residence. And taking a look at the Supreme Court opinion, the court found that on its face the statute accords preferential treatment to the expression of views on one particular subject. Information about labor disputes may be freely disseminated and discussed ... In the Supreme Court opinion they talk about the legislative intent that was exemplified at the time our law was passed, and I quote the Illinois legislative intent when this statute was passed, 'The Legislature finds and declares that men in a free society have the right to quiet enjoyment in their homes, that the stability of community and family life cannot be maintained unless the right to privacy and a sense of security and peace in the home are respected and encouraged, that residential picketing, however; just the cause the inspiring it disrupts homes, family, and communal life, that residential picketing is inappropriate in our society where the jealously guarded rights of free speech and assembly have always been associated with respect for the rights of others. For these reasons, the Legislature finds and declares this Article to be necessary'. In drawing a distinction the United States Supreme Court said, quote, 'We are not to be understood to imply, however; that residential picketing is beyond the reach of uniform and

non-discriminatory regulation, for the right to communicate is not limitless. In sum, no mandate in our Constitution leaves states and governmental units powerless to pass laws to protect the public from the kind of boisterous and threatening conduct that disturbs the tranquility of spots selected by the people either for homes when they can escape the hurlyburly of the outside business and political world, or for public and other buildings that require peace and quiet to carry out their functions such as courts, libraries, schools, hospitals, and places of business. Preserving the sanctity of the home, the one retreat to which men and women can repair to escape from the tribulations of their daily pursuits and surely an important value. Our decisions reflect no lack of solicitude for the right of an individual to be let alone in the privacy of the home, sometimes the last citadel of the tired, the weary, and the sick'. The bottom line is, according to the Supreme Court, the state's interest in protecting the well being, tranquility, and privacy of the home is certainly of the highest order in a free and civilized society. The crucial question, however; is whether the Illinois statutes advances that objective in a manner consistent with the command of the equal protection clause.

Speaker Bradley: "Have you concluded?"

Marovitz: "Not yet, Mr. Speaker."

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

Johnson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I

think as much as any individual in this House I know what residential picketing is. In 1977, my first year here, I voted as I have since then against the Equal Rights Amendment. Father's Day morning in June of that year I had at least forty people for at least two hours in what was, I think, polite sense...the polite definition a very disruptive picketing in front of my home. And my kids still remember that. They picketed in front of my office, at the law office, and they picketed again in front of the house. And so I think, from personal experience, I know what the intention of the Amendment is. But I oppose Representative Marovitz on this Amendment. The Urbana police asked me at the time if I wanted to have them arrested under this statute, and I said no. And I think notwithstanding the fact that my life may have been disrupted that the pro ERA people who picketed in front of my house have an absolute constitutional right to express their opinion in that manner as long as they were marching on a public way and the fact that I'm a public official I think opens me up as it ought to open people up in a free society to people's demonstrations, other people's demonstration on ideals and principles that they believe in. And as inconvenient as you may feel it is and other people may feel it is, I think you're trampling on people's first Amendment rights and their fourteenth Amendment rights to tell them that they can't picket residentially for any reason. And for that reason, and I'm probably the only 'no' vote on this Amendment, I oppose Representative Marovitz's Amendment. I

oppose it in any sense whether you restrict people's right to picket in labor management relations or anywhere else. I think they ought to have that right in a free society and I'm going to vote 'no' on this Amendment."

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

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Hanahan: "If I had a business and I operated out of my house such as a contracting business which is very typical of small contractors, and I operated out of my house, you mean to tell me that under this proposed Amendment I would not be able to picket the household of the owner of a company?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Under the first sentence of the Amendment, if the place of residence is used as the business, picketing is not prohibited. You may picket at that residence."

Hanahan: "Alright. Well, let me give you an example..."

Marovitz: "...that answers your question."

Hanahan: "...in the city of Chicago, Mr. Marovitz. It is not unlikely to have a remodeling or a home building contractor to have an office someplace but they really work out of their office in the house. This is very typical. It's not something unique. It's not something unusual, and I've had, my own personal experiences, where the only way I can get a wage claim paid, the only way I could get some action on a job site was to picket in front of somebody's house and let his neighbors that he's too cheap to pay the wages owed to the family that was picketing him. And you

mean, under this Amendment, I would not be able to use the first Amendment of the Constitution to say, because he uses his house and he doesn't use it as necessarily his office, that I can't let his neighbors know what a cheap SOB he is?'

Marovitz: "Under the Illinois law up until last Friday, you couldn't do that anyway. Picketing at a place of residence was prohibited under Illinois law as it is in many, many other states. And, as a matter of fact, since the United States Supreme Court has struck down our law, this won't affect labor picketing anyway ~~because they've said that it's unconstitutional.~~"

Hanahan: "Well, I thought in your explanation in the dissertation you read that you could not distinguish, you could not discriminate between the types of picketing whether it be labor or whether it be a personal reason or like ERA or abortion or what have you. You're allowed to picket a residence under this Amendment if the issue is connected to a labor dispute?"

Marovitz: "You are not allowed, under this Amendment. This would cure the defect expounded by the United States Supreme Court so that you would not be allowed to picket at a place of residence and the single exemption that we granted which was found to be discriminatory by the United States Supreme Court would be removed and therefore the constitutionality would be upheld."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I happen to feel very sensitive that there are certain rights that should not be...should not be trampled on

lightly by any State Legislature, and that certainly is the right of people communicating a displeasure of any action by anyone. I say to any public official or to anyone in the public sector that feels that they need some sort of special or unique privilege of being protected that if they can't stand the heat, they ought to get out of the kitchen. I join Representative Johnson. There is nothing wrong with expressing somebody's viewpoint. We do it here on the floor peacefully. We're not asking for somebody to picket unlawfully and causing chaos or causing a riot, but to peacefully picket in front of somebody's residence to allow them to....allow their neighbors to know what that person stands for, I feel, is too basic a right in our society to be easily given up on some hope that somehow we're going to give privilege to some elected official because he can't stand the heat. Harry Truman best said it, the guy ought to get out of the kitchen if he can't stand it. And I, for one, along with Representative Johnson oppose this Amendment."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Indicates he will."

Leinenweber: "Representative Marovitz, I have, in my hand, Amendment #8. The text of your change, is that the same as Amendment #6?"

Marovitz: "The text is, yes."

Leinenweber: "Alright. What you're doing is you're striking the words, 'of place of employment involved in a labor dispute'. Is that correct."

Marovitz: "That is correct."

Leinenweber: "I've spent some time here while this is being debated reading this thing, as a matter of fact, I read it a couple of times before it was called, and I, for the life of me, although I've been called dense, I can't figure out what you've done in this thing. It starts out, prior to the Amendment, making it illegal to pick...or unlawful to picket before a residence or dwelling except when the residence or dwelling is used as a place of business. Then, excluded from that, is a person peacefully picketing his own residence or dwelling and also does not prohibit the peaceful picketing of a place of employment involved in a labor dispute. Now you struck that, 'a piece (sic) of employment involved in a labor dispute', but you leave in the exception, 'when the residence or dwelling is used as a place of business'. How did you actually change the previous law, which was not a paragon of clarity, when you still leave in the exception that if it's a place of business?"

Marovitz: "Because it no longer refers to the substance of the message that you're trying to get across which would violate the first Amendment. That takes away the specific exemption for the type of message that you're trying to get across which is what the Supreme Court found discriminatory and violative."

Leinenweber: "In other words, if we adopt this Amendment, you may picket a residence involved where...which is used as a place of business or a place of employment involved in a labor dispute. Is that correct?"

Marovitz: "If it is a place of business, yes. If the

residence is a place of business or vice versa."

Leinenweber: "And involved in a labor dispute."

Marovitz: "That's correct."

Leinenweber: "So, what..."

Marovitz: "The first sentence is the prohibition."

Leinenweber: "Alright. But, as Representative Hanahan points out, if it's not a place of business, if there is a...say a non-union contractor doing a job on a private residence then, since...then it would be illegal to...for a union or union people to come out and picket that residence where the non-union contractor is employed. Is that correct?"

Marovitz: "Are you talking about the construction site?"

Leinenweber: "Yeah. Suppose I hire a non-union contractor to come in, or a contractor who is engaged in a labor dispute to come in to remodel my kitchen. Representative Hanahan takes offense that there's a contractor using a non-union laborer remodeling my kitchen. Since my residence is not a place of business, although it is a place of employment, he would be prevented from coming out and informing the public that this was a non-union contractor engaged...while a strike was going on. Is that correct?"

Marovitz: "No, that is not correct. Because that would be governed by federal law which permits exactly such picketing."

Leinenweber: "Well,..."

Marovitz: "And federal law is preemptive in this area."

Leinenweber: "So, then what you're saying is the Illinois law would have no application at all."

Marovitz: "In that situation where the work is going on at a construction site, the picketing would be on the construction site governed by federal law and the picketing would be allowed."

Leinenweber: "So the Illinois law, even though it specifies that this is illegal, would not...could not be enforced. Is that right?"

Marovitz: "No, not in that circumstance that you mentioned."

Leinenweber: "The Illinois law really is governs just residential picketing situations, non-construction, non-working situations..."

Marovitz: "Well, granted limited exception, that is what the court found unconstitutional."

Leinenweber: "There's no exception in Section 21.1-2 for the situation which I described and which I think...."

Marovitz: "That's correct."

Speaker Bradley: "Bring your questions to a close, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Just one final...why didn't you clean this up then to exclude the situation that federal law preempts?"

Marovitz: "Well, if we were going to clean up the Section, we'd have a lot of work to do to clean up the Section. I didn't write the Section and I don't know if anybody in this room wrote the Section. What we tried to do is take out the exemption, the specific exemption that the court found objectionary...objectionable and unconstitutional."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I think that in the attempt to clean this particular provision up that it's not been cleaned up. There's still problems with it. I think

that this is one of the reasons why it is a good idea for Bills to go through the Committee process where they can be looked at, you know, some leisure and dispatch and have witnesses tell us exactly how they would apply so we can staff analyze and so forth. So, I think perhaps at this time, it would be a good idea not to adopt this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman moves the previous question."

All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye',
oppose 'no'. The ayes have it. The Gentleman from
Cook, Mr. Marovitz, to close the debate."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This situation that the United States Supreme Court ruled as unconstitutional is very important to all of us here and it's very important to the citizenry of the State of Illinois. We've had a residential picketing prohibition in this state for years as many other states do. If people want to picket, there's always an opportunity to picket that individual at a place of employment. But there have been many, many instances cited where individuals, for whatever reason and we know there are a lot of emotional issues that are involved here, come to a place of residence, hold up the kinds of signs and pickets that really have a deleterious effect on one's children and one's family. This would cure the objections of the United States Supreme Court. It would make our statutes constitutional. We could once again have a residential picketing prohibition that we've had for

years and years and years, and just eliminate the exception that the court found unconstitutional since they found that exception unconstitutional, if we're going to have any residential picketing statute at all, we can't have an exception in it anyway. So this just removes the exception that's going to eventually have to be eliminated if we're going to have a constitutional residential picketing statute. It affects everyone of us here. It's an important piece of legislation. It's an emergency. It follows the Supreme Court, United States Supreme Court request and finding and opinion, and I would ask for an affirmative vote so once again we could have a constitutional residential picketing statute in Illinois."

Speaker Bradley: "Question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, to explain his vote."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court itches and Mr. Marovitz scratches. Two weeks ago they decide a case. There isn't a lawyer here who's even received the case. It takes a couple of months before you even get them in the advance sheet. Not only are we not only having committee hearings, nobody has received a copy of the decision. Is there a problem? I haven't heard of a case of residential picketing in years in Illinois. They could certainly wait until the next Session so that lawyers could at least read the decision. Why should the United States Supreme Court...why don't we have an open line to them and

everytime they make a decision we'll automatically put an Amendment on, we'll dispense with committee hearings, we'll dispense with due process, we'll just automatically react, slap an Amendment on and forget about first Amendment rights and the right of the people to be heard. And I vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen, to explain her vote."

Pullen: "Thank you. All this Amendment does is comply with the Supreme Court decision so that our law can be reinstated. It is not a matter of scratching what the Supreme Court did. It is a matter of going along with what the Supreme Court did. It is a compromise to say, 'Okay, if we can't have it the way we had it, we at least want our ban on residential picketing back. So we'll go along with what the Supreme Court wants on it.' That's not a very good idea in a lot of cases but this is an extreme emergency, and I think that the Gentleman from McHenry..."

Speaker Bradley: "Continue."

Pullen: "Thank you. I think the Gentleman from McHenry ought to be aware that there are rights in this country of people other than labor unions too. There's a right to be secure in one's own home which is what the Supreme Court was protecting in the way that they wrote this decision."

Speaker Bradley: "This thing's only got...Alright. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "But not the Gentleman from McHenry just referred to. I..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "That was a very short count, Sir. At least ten seconds."

Speaker Bradley: "Well I...Somebody had fooled with the clock and there was not an efficient amount of time."

Skinner: "Someone was fooling with the clock. How sad....I don't know what people are afraid of. Are they afraid that this woman, Jackson, is going to come with a rifle and stand in front of their house and shoot out their windows? Generally, when people picket they just have a sign. They picket peacefully. If they hit you over the head with the sign, you can have them arrested. Is there something in Chicago and the north side that one should be afraid of from picketing? Could the Sponsor of this Amendment tell us what he's afraid of?"

Speaker Bradley: "Everyone that's not entitled to the floor the doorkeeper will see that they are removed immediately. All those people not entitled to the floor. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I'm going to support this because I have had one time a fire bomb thrown in my house but that has nothing to do with the matter here. However, I am thinking of my neighbors. I haven't heard them mentioned particularly, but I believe a residential area which has neighbors in it obviously, those neighbors should be free of any picketing. Keep the picketing where it belongs to the place of business or whatever, but keep it out of the residential area."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar, to explain his vote."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just a few speakers back mentioned the fact that he hadn't heard of anybody being picketed on the issue. Well, I happen to be one that was picketed a while back on an issue and I think this is a good Amendment. I think it's very important. I don't like the idea of people walking around my home even though they've got just signs. Not only did it bother me and my family but it bothered the neighborhood, a quiet residential neighborhood. They've got no business being there. They can picket my business place. They can picket someplace else. They got no business picketing around my home, and I hope they don't come back."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the house, we do believe that the home is your castle and you ought to have a little peace and quiet and particularly we in the legislative life, we understand that our families and our children are interested in a little protection, a little peace and quiet and tranquility. And I think what this Amendment is doing...I want to congratulate Representative Marovitz and Daniels for presenting it, is protecting our Illinois law from interruption by the United States Supreme Court. This has been law for a long time. All we're doing is getting rid of a discriminatory feature in the law. It's a good Amendment. Everyone

who believes in the family and the peace and happiness of your home ought to support it. If they want to protest, they can write you a letter, they can go to your district office, or they can find you at a place of business but leave your home alone."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 93 'ayes' and 49 'nos' and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #7, Marovitz-Daniels, amends Senate Bill 1524.."

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

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to withdraw amendments 7 and 8."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendments 7 and 8. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading."

Speaker Bradley: "On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1813. Mr. Sharp...Mrs. Balanoff what purpose do you rise?"

Balanoff: "I wanted to make a small announcement. I wanted to remind the Members of the House, that there are limited number of tickets left to the special event of the season, the Mr. Wonderful Party on Sunday night. We have only a limited number of tickets also there are a few slots open yet, for the Mr. Wonderful Contest, you know this contest is open exclusively to men. So, see anyone of the women legislators for tickets and application to enter the contest. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, Mr. Sharp you wanted that Out of

the Record, alright. 1828, Mr. Keane."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1828, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill was read a second time previously. Amendments #1 were tabled. Amendment #3...I mean #2 lost."

Speaker Bradley: "What purpose does Mr. Dunn arise?"

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I'm just curious, is there permission granted for....movie pictures from the Speaker's Gallery."

Speaker Bradley: "Yeah....at the request of a couple Members."

Dunn: "Fine, thank you."

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Bowman. Amends Senate Bill 1828, as amended."

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

Bowman: "I ask leave of the House to withdraw Amendment 3."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, Keane. Amends Senate Bill 1828, on page two."

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

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Senate Bill 1828 deals with licensing of certified appraisal officers. The Bill, itself..mandates two new courses for that certificate. This amendment makes the effective date of the act October 1, 1980. The reason that the effective date is set at this time is that many of those who are completing their CIAO certificates will be finishing them up this summer, courses have been scheduled and they would receive it if this went into immediate

effect it would mandate them...to have two more of programs which they could pick up later. But I don't want the Bill to keep anyone who is getting their CIAO from getting it this summer. I would ask for approval."

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

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

Keane: "One?"

Leinenweber: "Yeah."

Keane: "Yes."

Leinenweber: "Is this the Bill that we stopped in the middle of a verification? A couple of nights ago? And we adjourned in the middle of verification?"

Keane: "That's right, this is the Bill but the Amendment that stopped it has been withdrawn."

Leinenweber: "That Amendment was withdrawn, fine, thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion, hearing none, the question is on the...Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Hallock: "What's the new effective date that you put in this Bill?"

Keane: "October 1, 1930."

Hallock: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, now on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Further amendments? "

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, Vinson. Amends Senate Bill 1828, as amended."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, Skinner. Amends Senate Bill 1828, by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof, the following."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, it's time again to talk about lack of assessment equity within Cook County. We have talked about this before, under the...under House Bill 980. I've recently gotten the assessment figures for Class

2 property that is homes and small apartments in Cook County and now find that a great many more townships are assessed above the average, than were assessed before the...above the average before. Coincidentally enough, of three of those townships, Hyde Park Township, South Chicago Township and West Chicago Township are predominately Black. Now the Chicago Tribune is running the series in which they're using the code word...code word 'Black Tax'. And yet I haven't seen an article on how homeowners living in predominately Black areas are assessed at a higher percentage of market value than our homeowners living in some predominately White areas. This Amendment mandates the Cook County Board of Tax Appeals to equalize assessments on each class of property. I don't care what level they equalize them too, they can equalize them to 2% of market value for all I care, just as long as everyone is assessed the same. And if the Board of Tax Appeals fails to do that it will

mandate the State Department of Revenue to do so. Now if you're from Cook County and you want to protect your homeowners and you are assessed below the 11.75% on the list that I will read. You ought to vote 'no', on this Amendment. If you're from a township that's assessed above 11.75%, you ought to be voting 'yes', because you'll end up cutting your taxpayers taxes. Hyde Park Township is now at 13.01%. Jefferson Township is at 9.5%. Lake Township 13% Lakeview 10.2%. North Chicago 9.4. Rogers Park 9.7. South Chicago 13.5%. West Chicago 14.4%. Now in the suburbs; ~~Barrington Township is assessed at 10.7%.~~

Berwyn 11.5, Bloom 13.65. Bremen 14%. Calumet 12.8%. Cicero 12%. Elk Grove 11.8. Evanston 9.5. Hanover 9.9. Lemont 11.9. Leyden 11. Lyons 11.8. Maine 11.2. New Trier 8.6%. Niles 10.9. North Field 10.3. Norwood 8.9. Oak Park 10. Orland almost 14%. Palatine 10.9. Palos 12.5. Proviso 11.5. Rich 13.4. River Forest 11.6. Riverside 9.2. Schaumburg 11.4. Stickney 12.7. Thornton 11 and 3/4%. Wheeling 11% and Worth 12.8%. Now if your township was above 11.75% your homeowners and small apartment owners are being taken to the cleaners by the Cook County Assessors office...illegally taken to the cleaners, in my opinion. They're being forced to pay more than their fair share. If you're assessed less than 11.75% on the average, then you're homeowners and apartment owners are being unfairly under assessed and therefore under..undertaxed. I don't know whether color has anything to do with the assessment process in Cook County or not, but it seems at least coincidental that

the three townships in Chicago with the highest percentage of black population are among the highest assessed townships in Chicago. That's not right Ladies and Gentlemen, and I ask for your acceptance of Amendment #6 in order to rectify this situation in the future. And I would ask for a Roll Call on this if I might, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from Keane...or Cook, Mr. Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Amendment. As the Sponsor of the Amendment pointed out, this is House Bill 980. We've seen it before. The Amendment applies only to Cook County and in Cook County it directs the...amendment if adopted would direct the Board of Appeals to act as an equalizing authority. This provision does not take into account that in Cook County the Board of Appeals was not created to act as an equalizing authority nor does it have the capacity at the present time to serve as an authority for the 1.4 million parcels of real estate that exist in Cook County. And any...downstate boards of appeals are somewhat different and they are designed to be equalizing authorities but not so in Cook County. On page 7 of the Amendment what the...what the Amendment does is it kills a quadrennial assessment for all property except farms. It directs that the Board shall annually ascertain and determine the percentage relationship among the townships. This in effect...this in effect means that we will have an annual reassessment. The annual reassessment...to do an annual reassessment of a

million...point..point four pieces...parcels of real estate would be an unbelievable job. It would cause a great deal of..of unnecessary expense to county government and may or...might not even be possible to carry out. If the Board of Appeals fail to make a report to the..to the Department of Revenue which this Amendment mandates what would happen is is that in that area the Department of Revenue...the Depart...the Illinois Department of Revenue would come in and do their own assessment of this million point...one point four million parcels of property and the cost in terms of personnel for...for the department in gearing up every year to do this, would be enormous cost upon the State. Under the present system the Board of Appeals in Cook County may correct an assessment on a complaint. No powers are given at the present time to the Board of Appeals to equalize the assessment among the thirty-eight different townships in Cook County. The Department of Revenue would be...is still the final equalizing authority. If this Bill went into effect what would happen is that the Board of Appeals would do an equalization between the different townships and then the Department of Revenue would come in and put on their multiplier. What would happen is that an additional value would be placed on every parcel within the township, so that a parcel that may have originally been correctly assessed even though the township...have may been assessed...assessed in the aggregate at a level less than was needed would now end up being assessed at a higher level than its class would require. I would

ask that you vote against this Amendment."

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

Ronan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I question the germaneness of this Amendment. I don't think it's germane to the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Parliamentarian. Mr. Van Duyne what purpose do you rise?"

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', oppose 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman's motion prevails. Now on the question of germaneness. Same act, general title. It's germane. Mr. Keane you wish to close...or who's amendment....Mr. Skinner's amendment. You wish to close, Sir?"

Skinner: "If any of you have felt during the last five minutes like I felt last night while workman's comp. was being discussed I know understand how you feel when we discuss assessment matters. I would like to go through the arguments made against this Bill, most of which were completely fallacious. One by one, and then sum up. Number one the Board of Tax Appeals apparently isn't capable of doing this job according to the Sponsor of the Bill. That's funny, Harry Semrow, who's the chairman told the Tribune yest...last year that he'd be happy to have the authority. Now I think people like Representative Capparelli who happens to work for the Board of Tax Appeals, are fully capable of doing the equalization process which is required. This does not require the Board of Tax Appeals to reassess every individual property in Cook County. All it does is require them

to equalize among the thirty-eight assessment jurisdictions within Cook County. This will not cause an annual reassessment in Cook County. What it will cause is an annual equalization of assessments on the average by class by township. If you live in a home in township X in the suburbs, you'll be assessed at approximately the same percentage of market value as someone living in a home in township Y within the city of Chicago. This is not the case now, in fact, to find two townships that are assessed at the same percentage of market value is almost an overwhelming coincidence. It is not...if it's by design which the law would indicate it...it should be. The Cook County assessor's office just isn't following the law. Now, the Gentleman indicates that if the Cook County Board of Tax Appeals did not equalize assessments, that is issued township multipliers for those of us who are downstate. That the State would then come in and then reassess every individual piece of property. Well, that's just bologna, the State doesn't have the resources to do that nor does it...get...nor is it given the mandate to do that under this Amendment. What the State has given the mandate to do, is go and equalize assessments on the average, on township by township, and class by class basis, if the local authorities do not do their job. Now there...the Gentleman was right in one instance and that is that this is giving more power to the Department of Revenue with regard to Cook County. Then the Department of Revenue has with regard to downstate Boards of Review. Boards of Review downstate have the mandate to

equalize assessments in their given counties, but the State does not have the mandate to do the job as the local counties don't do the job. They probably should have that mandate but you'll have to take care of that next year. In the case of Cook County, we have had...now...we're now into our second so called reform assessor and those reform assessors have not been able to equalize assessments even within quadrants. They have apparently not even made much of an effort. It seems to me that since local governments are children of the State Legislature under the State Constitution that if those local children misbehave and do not follow the State laws of equalization of taxes, that it's time for daddy and mommy, sitting here in the State Legislature perhaps to reprimand the child government that is the Cook County Assessor's Office for not having equalized assessment on homes. And indeed perhaps we ought to even ask the Cook County Assessor if he is discriminating on the basis of race. If that is the reason that West Chicago is the highest assessed township in Cook County despite the fact that West Chicago was not reassessed in the last quadrant. Is that the reason that South Chicago is assessed at 13.5% of market value, while the average is 11.75% and is that the reason that Hyde Park township which goes all the way to the bottom of the city of Chicago, the southern boundary, it's not just what is known as Hyde Park in the city of Chicago. Is that the reason that township is assessed at 13.01% which is also above 11.75%? Is it race or is it incompetence. It is one or the other, now since the Cook County Assessor's

Office refuses to reform itself, I offer Amendment #6 which would force such a reform on the Cook County Assessor's Office and I respectfully ask your assistance in forcing this reform. Let's give the Cook County Assessor....a spanking, apparently he deserves it."

Speaker Bradley: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed by vot...opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Mulcahey 'no', alright. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 52 'ayes' and 186 'nos'. The Gentleman's motion fails. Mr. Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise for the purpose of an introduction. Seated in the Speaker's Gallery are Representatives of the Illinois Minority Business Association, a recently formed group of Minority business persons throughout the State of Illinois. With them is their president, Mr. Leonard Williams from Chicago, and Mrs. Charlene Williams from Jacksonville, Illinois. Like you to join with me in welcoming them to Springfield."

Speaker Bradley: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #7, Vinson, Bradley. Amends Senate Bill 1828, as amended."

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

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a topic we've talked quite a bit on this year. I don't...I..I believe all the problems have been worked out. It applies uniformly state wide with the approval of the County Board. I don't

believe there's any opposition to it at this time, and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question's on the Gentleman's motion. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point, Sir."

Mugalian: "I suggest that this Amendment is dilatory. That same Amendment and...and same proposal in essence, before."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, I think that's happened before. Mr. Vinson... Mr. Skinner on the Amendment."

Skinner: "It's not quite the same, Representative Mugalian, it's worse. This now covers the whole State, as I understand it. I wonder if Representative Vinson could tell us, against what is the 1% credit being made. For example, if one..if a hundred thousand dollar building were built on a lot that had a tax bill of one thousand dollars, would that lot tax bill be zero for the next year?"

Vinson: "Can't work through the mathematics in my mind on that particular equation but it would be applied against the next year's tax bill on that lot."

Skinner: "Well, 1% of a hundred thousand dollars is a thousand dollars, and if a tax bill on the lot were a thousand dollars, I would assume a thousand minus thousand means that..."

Vinson: "That's right."

Skinner: "...the company would pay no taxes, no property taxes the next year."

Vinson: "Your...your analysis sounds correct and I think

you're alright."

Skinner: "Well it's an interesting concept. I don't think I'd want it for my area but I'm afraid my County Board might pass it."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Hearing none, the question is on the Gentleman's motion, all in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes'...in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #...no further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. Mr. Madigan on 2019. Read it? It's been read a second time."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2019. This Bill has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Are there any motions in respect to Amendments 1 and 2?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion to table Amendment #1, by Representative Simms."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Simms on your motion, motion to table."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker in making this motion to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2019. Amendment #1 is a...a amendment that in effect was a Bill that has been considered by the House a couple times this Session. And that sets up the State funded Workers Compensation Fund that was vigorously opposed by the majority of Members of the House on two separate occasions. This Amendment would in effect replace..."

Speaker Bradley: "Excuse me, for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, arise?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker the Sponsor of this Amendment was Representative McPike who's temporarily off the floor. I think in all fairness he ought to be here to respond to Representative Simms. Maybe if Mr. McPike could hear us mentioning his name he would come to the Chamber."

Speaker Bradley: "Is Mr. McPike within the sound of our voice? It's the...it's the last Bill on Second Reading. Let's go to Third Reading, Mr. Madigan and we'll come back as soon as Mr. McPike appears. Alright, Senate Bills Third Reading, page 2. Senate Bill 1378. This is the last day for the substantive Bills, we've gone through them once when the attendance wasn't too good but it has to be taken care of today. So, now that Mr. McPike has joined us, let's go back to 2019 on Mr. Simm's motion to table Amendment #1. Proceed Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was indicating previously, the Amendment that we're seeking to table sets up a State funded worker's compensation fund and has been turned by the House on two separate occasions. This legislation, through the Amendment process would reenact what has been turned down by the House. We would be setting up, through the enactment of this amendment, a state funded worker's compensation fund, there is no appropriation that...to start up the program as indicated by the amendment which require this, and in principle the State of Illinois would be entering into the free enterprise system in competition against free enterprise and the history of government as it competes with free

enterprise, it always cost more and bureaucratically we're just establishing another bureaucracy of state government. And for these reasons, I make the motion to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2019, as I feel that this legislation is not in the best interest of the citizens of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright now, Mr. McPike...who's going to respond? Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike to respond. Oh...Mr. Hanahan, Gentleman from McHenry, Mr....Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, in addition to these first two Committee Amendments which have been adopted to this Bill and which there are motions to table, there's an Amendment #3 which would reenact our deliberations of last night. I don't see any purpose to be served in...in debating once again all the Amendments that were offered last night on the issue of worker's compensation. And in light of the persistence of the Sponsor of the Amendment #3 to move ahead with his Amendment, I plan to ask this Bill be taken from the record and I will not call it on Third...on Second or Third Reading."

Speaker Bradley: "Take the Bill out of the Record. Alright, now on the Third Reading, alright...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an introduction. In the West Gallery, to my right, is the wife of our Assistant Minority Leader, Elmer Conti, his wife Joan and his son, Steven."

Speaker Bradley: "Would they stand? Alright, now Senate Bills Third Reading appea...appears Senate Bill 1378.

The...oh, read it a third time."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1378. A Bill for Act to amend sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1378 as amended would require the Department of Public Aid to pay medical providers who are radiologists in free standing facilities, that have at least 65% of their case load being public aid recipients on medical assistance. They would have to be paid in two separate components for professional services and for facility use together with equipment and supplies. The problem that this Bill addresses is that currently the department is not taking into account the capital investment of these specialists in providing services to public aid recipients. Those who have a case load of at least 65% public aid recipients are having a great deal of difficulty staying in practice because of the departments unrealistic reimbursement level. This Bill would require the department to take into account the capital investment that they have so that these practitioners would be able to continue serving public aid recipients without either folding or going into a hospital to do their practice. Currently the...the Public Aid Department does reimburse hospitals for this service at a much higher rate that they do free standing radiologists. In order...in the long run serve...save money for the State to pass this Bill because it would allow these radiologists who are

performing services without having the all expenses of hospitals involved to continue serving these recipients. And I urge your favorable consideration of this important Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion....discussion. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in support of this legislation and I'd like to commend Representative Pullen for sponsoring this. It does exactly what she said, it helps to encourage medical care to under served areas and I ask for your support."

Speaker Bradley: "Question's on the adoptio...shall this become law. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Would you vote me 'aye', please."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 142 'ayes', 2 'nays', this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1457."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1457. A Bill for an Act to exempt drugs and medical supplies and certain foods for human consumption from occupation use taxes and to replace local revenues loss. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, this is the Bill that started out from the Senate as a categorical sales tax relief Bill exempting fresh meat, dairy products, poultry, fish

and so on. And when it was approved here in Rules and Revenue Committee on Second Reading yesterday by one vote the Bill was amended into the one cent reduction on sales tax. Respecting for the moment anyway, the wishes of the one vote majority of the House that put the amendment on the Bill. Representative Schuneman's amendment, which I'm sure was aimed at making the Bill better not killing the Bill. And he even had a... Representative Mautino as a Co-sponsor. At this time rather than tabling the Bill, I'm going to ask that the Bill be passed out, to be approved and sent back to the Senate in the form that it was amended yesterday on Second Reading and I therefore move you....that Senate Bill 1457 which contains the one cent reduction on the sales tax on food and medicine, as amended be approved now on Third Reading."

Speaker Bradley: "Question is shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mrs. Chapman would you vote me 'aye', please? Thank you. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 167 'ayes' and no 'nays'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1497."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1497. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Inheritance Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Yes, this ends my legislative program for 1980. All good things must come to an end. This is Senator Berning's Bill, similar to my Bill which we passed out

earlier. Mine was introduced last fall, his this spring but he is my Senator and what the Bill does is provide that closely held businesses have the same ten to fifteen year...if they qualify to pay their Illinois Inheritance Taxes that they have under the Federal estate tax. Only those that qualified as small business under the Federal estate tax would qualify under the Illinois Inheritance Tax. It would of course, apply to farms which are closely held family businesses as...as well as to regular businesses. And I know that the farmers are strongly for it and the small businessman, the small retailers strongly for it and I urge out of courtesy to my Senator that Senate Bill 1497 be passed as we indeed passed my House Bill earlier."

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

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I urge all of you to vote yea...yes on this 1497. It will help the farm people in there...inheritance tax in paying it so that they will not have to lose their farms at the death of one their family members. It will also help small business people who have the same thing happen to them. So, I urge you to approve 1497."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mrs. (sic) Conti."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Conti: "When you remove the cost on the inheritance tax, what do you anticipate the fiscal impact is going to be? Is it correct my analysis show anywheres from 10 to 40 million dollars?"

Pierce: "All the taxes will eventually of course be paid but there will be a loss in the early years. That's one reason why we amended it to apply only to people that are lucky enough to die after December 31, 1980 so there...be no refunds. But you're...you're correct...you're correct in that there will be...there will be a loss in the early years. But all the taxes will eventually be paid and they'll be paid with interest there's interest on these funds. It's hard to estimate the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission, which I'm chairman, estimates they'll be a ~~10 million to 50 million decrease in the year...in the~~ first five years and then that will of course will all come back into the State."

Conti: "Yea, well that...then I...I reluctantly get up and speak against this Bill because the concept of the Bill I agree with you...Mr. Sponsor but I'm a little concerned as I've been stating for the last two or three days that we are over a billion dollars on our budget now, yes eventually we will get the money back but we're looking at possible loss of 40 million dollars this year and I urge a defeat of this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to commend the Sponsor for his perception in picking up this Bill of Senator Bernings'. This...first of all...is a Bill that would reduce some income into the State coffers and for those of you who are upset about our spending proclivities. The major was we can stop our spending is to take away the money in the first place. And

that's what we ought to be doing. Secondly, the Sponsor I would like to commend because he has picked up one of the major planks of next president, Ronald Reagans platform planks and that is to abolish or reduce inheritance taxes at the federal level and I'm happy to have Representative Pierce on that campaign team helping us out and I think we all should be voting 'aye' on this."

Speaker Bradley: "Question is shall this Bill.....Mr. Pierce to close. Question is shall this pass."

Pierce: "Just to conclude. What we're doing here is presenting...preventing forced sales of small businesses and farms to pay inheritance tax. Well, I'm glad to hear that the Republican candidate for president is going to endorse this. It's been on the...in the federal estate tax for years under Democratic presidents and I might point out, it's not just a matter me picking this up from my colleague, Senator Berning. I introduced House Bill 2823 last fall, he introduced this Bill this spring. My Bill passed the House one day before his Bill passed the Senate but we're a team, we're working together, he is a Reagan alternate delegate, I understand, to the national convention and being of a mind to prevent the for sales of small businesses and liquidations of farms for inheritance and estate tax purposes, I support the Bill because if the federal government in the internal revenue code says it's valid, and I think it's valid for Illinois and I failed to point Representative Kent is a co-sponsor of this Bill in the House. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is will this Bill pass, all in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian, to explain his vote."

Mugalian: "The favored presidential candidate of Representative Totten, may not know who the president of France is, but he certainly doesn't know much about what...what this Bill does either, because it does not reduce inheritance taxes at all, it just mimicks the federal law that's been in existence for many, many years. It just calls for deferred payment with interest."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted...who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 150 'ayes', 9 'nays', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1541."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1541. A Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Workman's...Worker's Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to leave of the House to hear Senate Bills..."

Speaker Bradley: "Turn Mr. Taylor on."

Taylor: "I'd like to have leave of the House to hear Senate Bills 1541, 1543, 1544 and 1545 as a package. They are dealing with a ridesharing program. And they all deal with the same subject matter."

Speaker Bradley: "Hearing no objections...oh..I hear objections now. Alright, Mr. Taylor, you want to take 1541 then."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House (sic) Bill 1541 amends the Workman's Compensation Act. Exempt injuries from a car when a person is participating in a ridesharing arrangement from the coverage of the act. This is one of a series of five Bills, it was Sponsored by Senator Lemke with the intent of encouraging employment, employees to participate in ridesharing arrangements to and from work. This Bill excludes all ridesharing arrangements from the worker's compensation law, even those in which the employer provides compensation by...to the driver. So long as the...your ridesharing arrangements does not employ motor vehicles owned, leased or contracted by the employer."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Winchester: "This is the Bill went through the Transportation Committee, wasn't it, Representative Taylor?"

Taylor: "Yes, it is."

Winchester: "Alright, is this...this would require the employer who participates in the ridesharing program to furnish worker compensation benefits to those who are participating or would be covered by workman compensation for those who are participating in ridesharing programs."

Taylor: "Yes."

Winchester: "How many ridesharing programs do you have in the Northern part of the State?"

Taylor: "I only heard from one and that's in the area of 'Hoffman Estates', in the Northern part of Illinois, that's the only one."

Winchester: "It's...it's fairly new program, isn't that correct?"

Taylor: "Yes, it is."

Winchester: "And so far there's less than 20, I think businesses that are participating in the program. Would you think that if we pass this legislation that this might be a detriment to employers, don't you think that if employers were going to have to pay workman's compensation claims for those who are riding to and from work, that they probably discontinue being in the program."

Taylor: "I don't...I don't think that would be the case. I think that this is..."

Winchester: "Let me ask you this, if there was an accident, wouldn't those people be able to sue for damages through there regular insurance programs furnished by the employer as well as apply for or sue for worker compensation benefits?"

Taylor: "Mr. Winchester, it would only be covered if the employer owned and drove the vehicle himself. That's when he would have the problem with the workman compensation act."

Winchester: "If the empl...only if the employee owned and operated?"

Taylor: "Yes."

Winchester: "I don't believe that was brought up in the Committee, Representative Taylor. I don't think that's the way you explained it, and I don't think

that's the way the analysis on the issue was but I want to speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Winchester: "I...I rise in opposition to this particular Bill because the ridesharing program is a fairly new program and I think it was something that come down from the federal government from perhaps in the past. The State supported the concept and perhaps the concept is good as a means of conserving energy and those highly populated organized areas, but I'm of the opinion and I'm...I'm quite of afraid and I think other Members on the committee are too that if we are going to force...and as I understood it...employers will be paying employees who have vans and cars who are using it in a pool and what you're trying to do under this legislation is also make the employer furnish workman compensation. And I think the quickest thing to...to abolish, or discontinue or to eliminate the ridesharing concept is to force the employer to provide workman compensation insurance, and so therefore, I would ask the Members to defeat this Bill."

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

Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker the Amendment also states that or either that there is something wrong with our analysis, that even if this would expand the employer's liability for workman's compensation even where they don't own the van, the car themselves so I say the Amendment even makes the Bill even that much worse. And I would like to see the defeat of this Bill."

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

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Birkinbine: "First off, Mr. Taylor, we are talking about the Bill itself and not an Amendment, right? Third Reading of the Bill, fine. Why...why is it that this is being offered now, when an Amendment that exempted employers from just the kind of thing you're doing was the one amendment that was approved by the Democratic leadership in that show we yesterday."

~~Taylor: "Representative Birkinbine, I'd thought that if we passed this out and sent on to the Governor's desk it could not be used as a vehicle for workman's compensation."~~

Birkinbine: "I beg your pardon."

Taylor: "I said we sent it on to the Governor's desk it would not be used as a vehicle for workman's compensation."

Birkinbine: "Well, Mr. Speaker if I could speak to the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Birkinbine: "The idea of van pooling or car leasing for the purpose of moving people to and from work is one that frankly, has been encouraged by the Carter administration. It's a way in which, not only can companies try and make it easier for their employees to get to work thereby increasing average attendance at work. It can also cut costs naturally, through having a number of people travel to and from work in one vehicle. But to get these employers now with

workman's compensation, it's going to do one thing. They're going to say 'No dice, no way am I interested in organizing a vanpool or carpool situation from my company, if all it's going to mean is increased costs but more so increased liability. 'It's absolutely nuts, what you're doing is torpedoing the potential for a good plan. Now, if there's a...real example of how this is working with Zenith Corporation which is right close to my district. They have had such a carpool operation. There was an accident, the car was driven by an employee but..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, Mr. Birkinbine would...turn that TV camera on the other way, the light's shining right in some of the Member's eyes."

Winchester: "...but there has been an attempt made to hit the company with a workman's comp. claim, for this. What you're going to do is drive out or discourage any company from ever considering vanpooling. It's a self-destructive type of Bill and I recommend you vote 'no'."

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

Schuneman: "Thank you...thank you Mr. Speaker. Representative Taylor, I wasn't sure from your explanation of the Bill, whether this is an expansion of worker's compensation coverage as it exists now or if you're attempting to restrict it in such...in some way."

Taylor: "No, we're not trying to restrict it, it's..."

Schuneman: "I'm sorry, I can't hear you."

Taylor: "No, we're not trying to restrict it, it's just an expansion in the ridesharing program. Trying to

conserve energy in our state."

Schuneman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Schuneman: "As Representative Birkinbine has pointed out there is agreed language on the ridesharing and ridepooling arrangements under workman...worker's compensation that was agreed upon by both sides of the aisle and the Amendments that were adopted last night, I think it would be a mistake to pass out another Bill with different language which may have entirely different implications than was...in the language that was agreed upon last night and on that basis I'm going to withhold my vote on this Bill."

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

Mulcahey: "Just to move the previous question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman moves the previous question, all in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, to close the debate."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I can see right now that you're really wanting to play politics with this good Bill. This Bill is certainly is much better than the amendment that was adopted last night to the workman's compensation act. I think that this will expand the ridesharing program throughout the State of Illinois. I think it will help conserve the energy. I think it's a good step in the right direction for the State of Illinois to go."

And if you want to turn it back at this time, I think you're making a very bad mistake in light of the fact that we do have the energy crunch here. I solicit your support for Senate Bill 1541."

Speaker Bradley: "Question is on the...shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, to explain his vote."

Vinson: "I think people ought to keep in mind, in voting on this that what this that what this really may be is a backdoor effort to subsidize the CTA and the RTA. What the Gentleman's doing is trying to put out of business all of the private motorpooling and vanning in the Cook County area so that those people are forced under the CTA and RTA. And I'd urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 58 'ayes', 78 'nos'. The Bill...Mr. Kelly votes 'aye', the Bill having failed to receive the...Mr. Taylor what purpose do you rise?"

Taylor: "Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Bradley: "I think we need a few more votes for that. Bradley 'aye'...back there...O'Brien 'aye', Red...alright, just a minute, we'll go slow enough so the Clerk can catch up. Bradley 'aye', O'Brien 'aye', Redmond 'aye', Grossi 'aye', Donovan 'aye', Rea 'aye', Matijevich 'aye', Steczo 'aye'. Mr. Mautino...Mr. Mautino you voting 'aye', Mr. Mautino 'aye', Kane 'aye', we need one more...Mr. Collins...alright, Mr.

Hannig votes 'aye'. That's 70 'ayes', and the Bill now will be placed on Postponed Consideration, at the request of the Sponsor. Senate Bill 1543."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1543. A Bill for an Act removing the state income tax and wage law implements to..."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook..."

Clerk O'Brien: "...ridesharing. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, maybe I can have leave to hear the other three Bills as a package."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay."

Taylor: "Senate Bill 1543 amends the...minimum wage act from excluding employees in the ridesharing arrangements from the act during period of their work, amends income tax act to include from net income compensation received of the driver in the ridesharing program. This Bill is part of the package aimed at encouraging private and corporate ridesharing programs. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House I solicit your support for Senate Bill 1543."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is shall this Bill pass. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 132 'ayes', 22 'nos' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1544."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1544. A Bill for an act to amend sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third

Reading of the Bill."

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

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.
This Bill simply limits the liability and court suits.
And I solicit your support for our Senate Bill 1544."

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

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition
to Senate Bill 1544. There is a long standing rules
regarding this type of situation. I think anytime we
attempt by statute either to define, clarify or change
these long standing common law rules, we create more
problems more uncertainty then there was before. By
specifying that for example that the employers
exempted from liability when the vehicle is not owned,
leased or contracted it very well could be interpreted
by a court that when the vehicle is owned, leased or
contracted for by the employer that there definitely
would be liability. I think again this area of the
law is very, very clear. It's an area that I
personally happen to deal with on a day to day basis.
I think that when we attempt define, to clarify to
except and so forth that we only muddy the waters in
an area which is eminently clear. It's an area that
needs no clarification, it's an area that the ordinary
automobile liability insurance contracts take care of.
And let's vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a
question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Tuerk: "I see by the Digest that...and I would agree with the original intent of this Bill as I would've agreed with Senate Bill 1541. However, the problem as I see it is...are in the House Amendments because I'm not so sure that that's what the Bill does any longer. Could you clarify that for me, please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Representative Tuerk, I don't have an amendment on '43, that's '44."

Tuerk: "Well, that's practically the same amendment that was on '41."

~~Taylor: "Amendment on '44. Mr. Speaker, on 2 in answer to Representative Tuerk, it just says that if the employer drives....pays a days wages to the driver, is in when he would become liable, and I think it's a good concept."~~

Taylor: "Amendment on '44. Mr. Speaker, on 2 in answer to Representative Tuerk, it just says that if the employer drives....pays a days wages to the driver, is in when he would become liable, and I think it's a good concept."

Tuerk: "Well, if I could speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Tuerk: "It seems to me that House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1544, as also Senate Bill 1541 waters down the effect of what the Bills were originally intended to do and that as I understand it, was to exempt from worker's comp. any ridesharing plan. Now, as been pointed out previous dialog as...that the rideshare plan is relatively new, particularly with business and industry. And it's one that should be fostered and I think with the Amendment on there which says in effect that if an employer has paid wages to an employee for services rendered that they in effect would be covered. And rather than exempted from the coverage I think it's counter-productive and I would urge a

negative vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Taylor to close. Oh, I'm sorry the Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Representative Taylor maybe you can answer this question, but I'd like to address it to the last speaker as well. As I take a quick look at this, this looks to me like protections for the corporation for an example; if Caterpillar had a ridesharing program, this would indemnify them from any claims that could be brought against them, as part of the program. If I'm mistaken I would like someone to show me exactly where I'm mistaken. It would seem to me that this is protection for the owner or the company. I find it very difficult to see my Republican colleagues in opposition to this. I think it would be something you'd want to support. It allows if the driver is negligent can be sued as I understand it, but the corporation could not be assessed for that same provision or the company if it's not a corporation. Please read it and tell me if I'm wrong. Cause I have a hunch...I...I..I'm think I'm going to be...I'm going to vote for this because it looks like it's for the corporation and the business to protect them and maybe continue this type of program. If you get the Bill out and show me where I'm wrong it...had...I'd be happy to rel...rethink my thoughts on it. But it looks like to me it's okay."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, as I originally pointed out in my comment I think the original concept of this was good. But if you look at House Amendment #1 as I'm looking at in

the Digest and I haven't read the all the language but to me it seems to have some exceptions in there where that last clause and for which the employer has not paid wages to an employer for services rendered in driving the vehicle could be misinterpreted and as I said be counter-productive. That's...that's all...all I'm trying to do is clarify the thing and nobody has seemed to clarify it to my satisfaction. I understand what you're saying and in effect that's the concept that the ridepool philosophy and that is to indemnify the employer for...from workman's comp. claims as a result of people riding in...in a carsharing plan, you see. But I...I think the House Amendment as I say to repeat, counter-productive."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Birkinbine to clear up the question."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker in response...with response to Mr. Mautino.."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, he's not the Sponsor but he will..."

Birkinbine: "Well, I know that but clearing up the point. House Amendment #1 makes revision that employers will not be liable for injury to passengers, use of a auto...use of a motor vehicle for which the employer has not paid wages to an employee. Now in the Bill which we considered just before this, we exempted from the minimum wage provisions employees who might be paid for doing that kind of thing. What this would mean is that if indeed an employer paid a stipend to an employee for running a carpool the employer would then become liable for workman's comp. It's only if he wasn't paid anything that he would be exempt, according to this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Mr...Mr. Birkinbine in response to your question, your comment. You read the amendment but you didn't take it far enough. You left out six words if you'll look at the amendment it says 'has not paid wages to an employee for services rendered in driving the vehicle'. So therefore, you...your protection is for the employer as I read the Amendment."

Birkinbine: "Well, by receiving wages for services rendered in driving the vehicle."

Birkinbine: "And he is not receiving any so therefore you're...you're protecting the employer and putting if there is a problem in the negligence claim in a tort action, then upon the person who is driving rather than the company for which he works."

Birkinbine: "But the employer is only protected if they're not paying the driver any money at all."

Mautino: "Except if the vehicle which is not owned or leased or contracted for by that employer. I think we've got a misunderstanding. I think I'm right, and you're wrong."

Speaker Bradley: "All right further discussion? Mr. Taylor, you want to close the debate?"

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1544 do not create any new liability at all. Simply do not create any new liability and I solicit your support for Senate Bill 1544."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Deuster, one

minute to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, our staff analysis indicates that it appears that this Bill would do just the opposite of the Sponsor's intent which is to remote...promote ridesharing because it is true it would not create any new type of liability but it would expand and broaden the liability. I think we ought to vote 'no'. And Mr. Speaker in the event this does reach 89 votes, I would respectfully reserve the right to request a verification."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 87 'ayes' and 62 'nos'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to Poll the Absentees."

Speaker Bradley: "We'll Poll the Absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Abramson. Bowman. Breslin. Campbell. Dawson. Ewell. Ewing. Hoffman. Huff. Kucharski. Laurino. McGrew. Mugalian. O'Brien. Pechous. Peters. Piel."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Rea."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Ewing, 'no'." Mr. Rea votes 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Robbins. Ropp. Schisler."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hoffman how'd you want to be... 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Stearney."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Pechous, 'aye'. Pechous 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Willer. and J. J. Wolf."

Speaker Bradley: "Mrs. Willer, Mrs. Willer."

Willer: "Yes, vote me 'yes' please. Record Mrs. Willer as voting 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "91 'ayes', 64 'nos'."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question there are 91 'ayes', 64 'nos'. Jane Barnes, 'aye'. 92 'ayes', 64 'nos'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority...Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "I would like to request a verification, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman requests a verification. Call the Affirmative."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Balanoff. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Bradley. Braun."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Deuster, can Mr. Stuffle be verified."

Deuster: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Brunner. Bullock. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Epton. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Jaffe. Dave Jones."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Deuster, Mr. Slape wishes to be verified."

Deuster: "That's fine, Mr. Speaker."

Clerk O'Brien: "Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijevich."

Speaker Bradley: "Mugalian 'aye'. Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Change my...from 'no' to 'aye', please."

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. McBroom as voting 'aye'. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mautino. McBroom. McClain. McPike. Dyer. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. Oblinger. O'Brien."

Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey."

Speaker Bradley: "What purpose does Mr. Ebbesen rise."

Ebbesen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's been indicated by the Senate sponsor that he's unhappy with the Amendment and would probably...and will remove it in the Senate and for that reason I'd like to change from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Mr. Piel wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Preston. Rea. Reed. Richmond. Ronan. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Schraeder. Schuneman. Sharp. Slape. Stanley. Steczko. Stuffle. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. Van Dwyne. Vitek. VonBoeckman. White. Wikoff. Willer. Williamson. Sam Wolf. Young. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

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

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I think I've seen the error of my ways, I'd like to have my vote changed from 'yes' to 'no', please."

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Schuneman as 'no'. Mr. Wikoff wishes to be recorded as 'no'. Mrs. Reed wants to go from 'aye' to 'no'. Stanley 'aye' to 'no'. Alright, any other...Stearney just 'no', you...record Mr. Stearney as 'no'. Mr. Robbins 'no'. Mrs. Macdonald from 'present' to 'no'. Mr. Huff 'aye'. We're starting with 92 'ayes'. Question of the Affirmative."

Deuster: "The first question is Mr. Brummer."

Speaker Bradley: "Brummer. He is not in his seat. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Deuster: "Is Mr. Bullock there, I thought I saw him, and I wasn't sure."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Bullock. I can't see him. There...he's there...I see his hand."

Deuster: "...there's a huddle there....Christensen."

Speaker Bradley: "He's there."

Deuster: "Farley."

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

Deuster: "Flinn."

Speaker Bradley: "Flinn. He's not in his seat. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Deuster: "Giorgi."

Speaker Bradley: "Giorgi. He's not in his seat. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off....Mr. Dunn what purpose do you rise?"

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Dunn have leave to be verified."

Deuster: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, further questions?"

Deuster: "Mr. Hanahan."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hanahan. Is right here and Mr. Flinn has returned, put him back on."

Deuster: "Mr. Jaffe."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Jaffe. He's not in his chair. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off and Mr. Jaffe is...or Mr. Giorgi has returned put him back on and Mr. Leon wishes to be verified. Leave granted."

Deuster: "That's fine. Mr. Emil Jones."

Speaker Bradley: "Emil Jones. In the aisle."

Deuster: "Oh...he's down...coming down the aisle. Mr. Katz."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Katz. Mr. Katz? Katz."

Deuster: "K-A-T-Z."

Speaker Bradley: "K-A-...oh Katz."

Deuster: "Katz."

Speaker Bradley: "Can you verify Mr. Madigan, would you please?"

Deuster: "That's fine."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, how is Mr. Katz recorded."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the record. And what purpose does the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, rise?"

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm standing here along side the Senate Sponsor, he agrees with what I've said originally that the House Amendment fouls this Bill up. He is willing to take the Amendment off in the Senate and under those conditions as long as I have that word and that assurance I can vote for the Bill because the Bill was good...then the original concept. And if that be the case, if the House Amendment comes off of this Bill as well as 1541, I have no problem. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Tuerk from...go from 'no' to 'aye'."

Deuster: "Mr. McCourt."

Speaker Bradley: "'Aye'. Mr. Vinson, 'no' to 'aye'.
Alright, let's dump the Roll. All in favor vote
'aye', opposed 'no'."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker if I might explain my vote. On this I
respect what Representative Tuerk has...had said and
what the Senate Sponsor has said. I
think...Rep...Senator Lemke is a very influential
member of the Senate and will do everything in his
power to make sure that this House Amendment comes
back and trusting that that will be so. I'm happy to
cast an 'aye' vote, and withdraw my request for a
verification."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
who wish? The Clerk will take the record, on this
question there are 120...130 'ayes', 26 'nos' and the
Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is
hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1545."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1545. A Bill for an Act to
remove the legal impediments to ridesharing
arrangements. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill
1545 as amended will provide protection for the
passengers in the event of negligence on the part of
the driver. It's also a part of a ridesharing
package. I solicit your support for Senate Bill
1545."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Seeing none, Mr. McCourt I'm
sorry the Gentleman from Cook."

McCourt: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question."

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

McCourt: "As I understand from the analysis here, it seems to indicate that a vehicle that's used for ridesharing cannot be categorized as a bus or commercial vehicle. Then if that is true if Zenith Corporation should buy let's say a mini-bus and allow their employees use it in ridesharing arrangements that would mean that that mini-bus could park in any residential district in front of anyones home and could not be ticketed as a commercial vehicle even though you know and I know it is a bus just like a CTA might have a mini-bus or a school might have a mini-bus, is this correct?"

Taylor: "No, that's not correct. It does not apply to mini-buses. There are vanpooling in another act but not this particular legislation."

McCourt: "It seems to say loud and clear that that vehicles used for ridesharing agreements are not categorized as buses, commercial vehicles or common carriers. So, it is a bus. I think...I think we should be very, very careful about this particular Bill. This Bill has some very note worthy objectives but however, this particular Bill would allow any type of a commercial vehicle to be parked in front of your house, or your neighbors house and it could not be ticketed. I think this Bill should be defeated or at least taken from the record."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't agree with Representative McCourt this Bill only reduces the coverage for insurance for those particular companies. It does not apply to the vanpools anything under 12 seats, the ones that this

would be covered under."

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

Stearney: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Stearney: "The analysis states that...that this bus shall not...shall be excluded from filing proof of financial responsibility as a carrier for hire. Now if that be the case I understand it also has to have some insurance, but my inquiry is this, that vehicle could only have...could possibly have a minimum insurance policy of 15,000...30,000 and it could be carrying 8, 10, 15 passengers depending on the...the bus, itself. Now my inquiry is this perhaps that vehicle could be very well under...und...under insured because it does not have to comply with financial responsibility of a vehicle for common hire. Now could you tell me what kind of insurance this vehicle would be compelled to carry for the protection of the passengers?"

Taylor: "The insurance would be the same as school buses."

Stearney: "Where does it say that in the Bill?"

Taylor: "I've been informed that the school busing is not in the Bill but in the statutes."

Stearney: "Well, I'm rather unsure about that because the analysis states that it specifically excluded from complying with the proof of financial responsibility as the carrier for common hire but it need only carry insurance and that means it could have a 15, 30,000 dollar policy and but nevertheless carry 8, 10, 12 passengers and all be maimed and there wouldn't be sufficient insurance to cover those individuals now that seems to be a problem and I hate to rely on what

some other provision of another section of the statute requires. You're uncertain aren't you, Representative?"

Taylor: "Representative Stearney it's included in the same statute that school busing is."

Stearney: "Well, could you give me the Chapter and Section? We'll have Representative Deuster check that out, he's the only Member of the House that has the statutes on his desk."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, while we're waiting for that could we go to anot.."

Stearney: "We're waiting for Representative Taylor's staff aid to give us the Chapter and Section in which it's...it's stated that..."

Taylor: "Representative Stearney, Chapter 95 and 1/2, paragraph 8-101, Section 8101."

Stearney: "How does that read?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Deuster, do you have this Section?"

Taylor: "Line 23 is 'in addition this Section shall also abide the person from the corporation who are in the business of providing transportation service for minors to and from education or recreational facilities except that this Section shall not apply to public utilit....utilities subject to regulation under the act concerning public utility approved January...June 29, 1921."

Stearney: "Could you repeat that Representative, I didn't catch every word."

Taylor: "...as amended to the school buses."

Stearney: "Well, until then I...I'm very uncertain about the...the effect of this Bill and I think it should be

taken out of the record until we can be certain at least get a legal opinion from Representative Deuster as to whether these individuals would be insured in riding in this bus."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from.."

Taylor: "I think Representative Deuster is looking for that legal opinion but I think we have a good deal here, it certainly much better than the one that you introduced last night, Representative Stearney."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the Bill and quite honestly I'm not for sure whether it is a bad Bill or whether it is a good Bill but I know one thing for sure and we tried to point this out to the proper people in the committee, that one of these Bills should have went to Labor and Commerce and had it been directed to that committee probably you wouldn't have had the problems you had on the floor, and that was the first Bill. We saw that Bill as a vehicle bill for worker compensation reform. This bill we see as a vehicle bill for making changes in the RTA act, there are...there are some very serious questions about it, one of our Representatives on this aisle said he had talked to Senator Lemke and he assured him that...that one of the amendments put on by the House in Committee was definitely a bad amendment and that he assured him it would be taken off in the Senate. Well...well that amendment was offered at the request of Senator Lemke to Representative Taylor and if he thought it was a

bad amendment now, why didn't he think it was a bad amendment at the time it was offered in committee. There's something wrong with these Bills, something...something lying behind the scenes, that we don't know about, Mr. Speaker, and I...I just strongly recommend that...that we not pass this Bill and we vote against it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

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

~~Speaker Bradley: "Yeah. On the gentleman's motion. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, Mr. Taylor to close."~~

Taylor: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm surprised at Representative Winchester to think that I would be doing something behind the scene. I'm not that kind of individual plus the fact any...any part of the any chapter...trying to amend the RTA act into this Bill would be found unconstitutional, simply not the case. We simply trying to do what the President and the other trying to do to save energy throughout the country and this is a good direction...and all of us to go. I solicit your support for Senate Bill 1545."

Speaker Bradley: "Question is shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing to explain his vote. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Yes, Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to Poll the Absentees."

Speaker Bradley: "Clerk will Poll the Absentees. Currie
'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Poll the Absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Breslin. Casey. "

Speaker Bradley: "Casey n...Casey 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Dawson. Donovan. Ewell."

Speaker Bradley: "Donovan 'aye'....Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ewell. Greiman. Hoffman. Hoxsey."

Speaker Bradley: "Hoxsey 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Hudson. Laurino. Leverenz."

Speaker Bradley: "Leverenz 'aye'. Dawson 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mautino."

Speaker Bradley: "Mautino 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Molloy. Mugalian. Oblinger. Peters. Rea.

Robbins. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Telcser. Totten.

Van Dyne. Walsh."

Speaker Bradley: "Walsh wishes to be recorded as voting
'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Willer."

Speaker Bradley: "Willer 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Woodyard. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Rea 'aye'. The Speaker will vote 'aye'.

On this question there are 89 'ayes', 66 'no', and
this Bill having received the Constitutional....Mrs.
Satterthwaite 'aye'. Marovitz...Marovitz at Emil
Jones'..."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, I...I would ask...after Mr.
Winchester requests a verification, I would ask leave
for to be verified."

Speaker Bradley: "Can he be verified Mr. Winchester?"

Winchester: "Yeah.."

Winchester: "Verification of the Affirmative, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, just a minute, Mr. Giorgi."

Winchester: "He can be verified. Giorgi can be verified."

Speaker Bradley: "Marov...Alright, Mr. Vitek can be verified. Mugalian 'aye'. Okay, we're starting at 91 'ayes', call the Affirmative Roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Balanoff. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Casey. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Dyer. Epton. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin."

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

Flinn: "May I be verified? I've got to go off the floor for a little while?"

Speaker Bradley: "Verify him. Oh...Alright Mr. Winchester?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Huff. Jaffe."

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

Lechowicz: "To be verified."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Winchester. Lechowicz is verified. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Kane."

Winchester: "Kane's verified."

Clerk O'Brien: "Keane."

Winchester: "Keanes here."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kelly."

Winchester: "Kelly's here."

Clerk O'Brien: "Klosak."

Winchester: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kucharski.
Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan.
Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McBroom. McClain.
McGrew. McPike. Meyer. Mugalian. Mulcahey.
Murphy. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechons. Pierce."

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Ewell as voting 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pouncey. Preston."

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

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, may I be verified, please."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Winchester...Mr....yes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Sandquist.
Satterthwaite. Schneider. Sharp. Slape. Steczo.
Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Winchester, Mr. Madigan and Mr.
Preston would like to be verified."

Winchester: "Preston but not Madigan."

Speaker Bradley: "Preston's alright but Michael..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Vitek. VonBoeckman. White. Willer.
Williamson. Sam Wolf. Young. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, Mr. Garnisa. Verif...verify Mr.
Garnisa. Alright, questions of the Affirmative."

Winchester: "Mr. Speaker, what is the total count that we're
beginning with at this point?"

Speaker Bradley: "92 'aye'."

Winchester: "Jane Barnes."

Speaker Bradley: "How's she recorded? There she is over
here, on our side."

Winchester: "Brunner. Representative Brunner."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Brunner is in the

chambers."

Winchester: "Representative Christensen."

Speaker Bradley: "Is in his seat."

Winchester: "Representative Darrow."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Darrow, is not in his seat.

How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Winchester: "Representative Dawson."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Dawson is not in his seat

how is he recorded."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Winchester: "Representative Domico."

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

Winchester: "Representative John Dunn."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Winchester: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his seat. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Winchester: "Representative Klosak."

Speaker Bradley: "...is in the Chambers."

Winchester: "Representative Richmond."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Richmond is not in his chair. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Winchester: "Representative Ronan."

Speaker Bradley: "...is in Pierces'...no...Laurino's seat."

Winchester: "Is he here? Okay. Representative Saadquist..."

Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his seat. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Winchester: "Representative Schneider...he's here Mr. Speaker. Representative Slape."

Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his chair. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Winchester: "Representative VonBoeckman."

Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his seat. How's he recorded."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off, and return Mr. Richmond to the Roll. He's returned."

Winchester: "What about....Mr. Speaker? What about the full time Speaker, where's he at? Is he...is he listed as non-voting or voting or what?"

Speaker Bradley: "He's here."

Winchester: "I'll take your word for it. Alright, that's all I have."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Darrow has returned, put him back on the....and Mr. Katz, what purpose do you rise?"

Katz: "To be recorded as 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Katz as 'aye'. Mr. Totten wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Further questions? Alright, what's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 87 'ayes' and 67 'nos'. And the Bill having failed to receive the....you're

already 'aye', Mr. Dawson has returned, put him back on the Roll. Yes, you...you were taken off. No, on this question....Mr. Schraeder ret...goes from 'no' to 'aye'. Alright, that's 39 'ayes', 67 'nos'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.Senate Bill 1666. Mr. Telcser. Take it out of the record. Alright, let's get back to 1666."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1666. A Bill for an act to amend sections of the Capital Development and Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1666 is the authorization for the Capital Development Board. Alright, as all the Members will recall, we adopted I believe all the amendments offered by Members. This will be the authorization for the next fiscal year and I appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor will yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Conti: "Representative, is this the one that has the funds in for shoddy construction?"

Telcser: "No, it's not Representative. This is the authorization."

Conti: "Just....just the authorization."

Telcser: "Yes, Sir."

Conti: "It must be Senate Bill 16..."

Telcser: "It's not the appropriation."

Conti: "I see."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen."

Pullen: "Like to ask the Sponsor a question, please."

Speaker Bradley: "Indicates he'll yield."

Pullen: "As amended, Sir, how much is the bond authorization in this Bill?"

Telcser: "It is 2...\$270,682,000., some change."

Pullen: "What is the current bond authorization for the Capitol Development Board?"

Telcser: "The current is 1,559,582,000."

Pullen: "A billion five hundred something million..."

Telcser: "1,559,582,000 and 16 cents."

Pullen: "Oh the 16 cents, okay. And that's just for the Capitol Development Board."

Telcser: "That is correct."

Pullen: "This...this Bill proposes to increase that by over \$260,000,000 in bonded indebtedness?"

Telcser: "That is correct."

Pullen: "Thanks."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion. Mr. Telcser, you wish to close? And the question is shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Yes, Mr. Wolf, what purpose do you rise?"

Wolf J. J.: "I believe this takes 107 votes which...."

Speaker Bradley: "I think you're right. 107 votes. Alright, we're going to.. dump this Roll Call and take another Roll Call. Because there's people trying to get on and it'd be simpler...alright, now question

is on the Bill. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Everybody get on that wants to be recorded. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane to explain his vote."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd just point out that with this increase...200 additional million dollars in bond authorization that since we have had the new Constitution in 1970, this will bring our total General Obligation authorization...General Obligation bond authorizations up to almost four and a half billion dollars, that we have authorized in state debt in the first ten years under the new Constitution."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to ask for a Poll of the Absentees and remind the Members about the important projects that are in this authorization."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman requests a Poll of the Absentees. The Clerk will call the absent...alright, now...Currie wishes to be recorded 'aye', Capparelli 'aye'. Satterthwaite 'aye'. O'Brien 'present'. Grossi...Williams 'aye'. Hannig 'no'. Pierce 'aye'. Any additions? Balanoff 'aye'. On this question there are 107 'ayes', 49 'nos'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Schneider on 1729. By...the last Bill was passed by 3/5ths Majority. Read Sen...Bill 1729 for the third time."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1729. A Bill for an Act

relating to the education of certain children. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk is right.

This does relate to certain children. They are indeed special education children. In fact, in Illinois today there are over two thousand children in private placement who are being improperly served because the State of Illinois has placed us in a position of not allowing certain costs to be included as part of their education even though a local district has indicated in their individual education plan the need for that program for an appropriate education. Fundamentally, I am directing myself for, too, the group that we call the behaviorally disordered children. The State of Illinois, because of a statutory board created and known as the Governor's Purchase Care Board, limits certain kinds of expenditures which are appropriate by federal law for those children to have an appropriate education. I don't know that the State of Illinois nor that the State Board of Education nor that the Department of Mental Health has really met its obligation and fulfilled its purpose for those children to be appropriately educated as we have determined in a local level. I find it a disturbing trend or...not a trend, but an actuality in Illinois that for years I have, in part, ignored because I had assumed we were meeting our task. What really is at stake and is the core of the problem is, perhaps, the definition of what constitutes an appropriate...free and appropriate education. We are required, as you

all know I think, under 94-142 and the Education to the Handicapped Act and under the Office of Civil Rights through its analysis of the 504 provisions, that we should meet our obligations. The State of Illinois has not done that, and the Purchase Care Review Board, by not allowing things such as counseling and various forms of therapy to be created in the total description of the proper educational program, are, indeed, harming the children. So I think it's upon us...incumbent upon us, as State Legislators in the House and the Senate, to do more than call attention to the fact that children who are, in some cases, suicidal and need twenty-four hour total care, residential placement, are being denied that...that care. We have examples of parents who have had to face the tragedy of selling their homes, their furniture, and all of their possessions to meet the needs of that appropriate education because the State of Illinois is, in my judgment, in compliance with 94-142. The language that is added in my Amendment to Senate Bill 1729 addresses that concern by expanding the definition of 'therapy' to include various forms of counseling. I'll tell you what it means, is that if you look at present interpretation by the various agencies that the time frame that they direct themselves to is a school day of eight to three. What I'm suggesting to you and what the 94-142 provisions provide is that the educational need runs far greater than the eight to three time frame than most children need for a free and appropriate public education. This, then, represents a challenge to all

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 25, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

of us, I think, to make a proper assessment of how we react to those families. Families that in many cases will be going bankrupt, but most importantly, is that the children who forever will have a world closed off to them because we have failed to raise the question and provide the answer for those children to be educated properly. So it's with that attitude that I address this Bill. The attitude that the State of Illinois and that you and I, as Members of the House, have got to be the advocates. It's unfortunate that we have turned to that role. It would seem to me that special education in the State Board or that the Mental Health Department of the State of Illinois ought to be the appropriate groups or agencies to provide that function. But nonetheless, in my judgment, they have failed and that responsibility is now ours. Other concepts to be included that I think conform with 94-142 in addition to expanding the definition of 'therapy' which would, I think, guarantee the fulfillment of the IEP's or the Individual Education Plan for that child would be the functioning role...the proper functioning role of the State Board of Education. I think we are finding that the State Board is sharing that responsibility with Mental Health. That is inappropriate because 94-142 does not require that. Mental Health, in many respects, is a minimal role in dealing with these kinds of children, and the State Board has agreed or, apparently, has been willing to share that responsibility despite the fact that the State Board, in a law suit that was filed recently, indicated that

perhaps they were being...that the State Board itself was supportive of that court case. So there...that provision which gives the State Board greater authority in the appropriate educational decision. There's a sunset provision which will allow children to be placed in the free and appropriate education which requires the payment of that child's care to be ongoing until the appropriate placement is found. And then, that child will then be...meet the educational needs and then that money will, of course, be reimbursed. But the sunset provision is a provision that will give the State of Illinois an opportunity to meet or have the incentive to meet the needs of many of the children in our state. As I started out earlier indicating that there are over two thousand kids that are not being appropriately cared for because we are not permitting cost to be considered for their education. We don't know how many kids are really out there that need additional care, that have been denied the proper education, who have been...gone through the torturous bureaucracy of the Mental Health Department and have been faced with the frustration of not being served or satisfied to meet their needs. One final point that some of you may already be familiar with, and that's in the Bill also, was in Senate Bill 1000, where now children who would be in residential facilities can be reimbursed...the districts can be reimbursed for that child to be educated off site. At this time, that's not allowed or at least it's not clear that is is allowed. So, I think a Bill that does nothing more than try to meet

the appropriate educational needs of those children...it doesn't try to solve a court case. It doesn't try to undercut an agency or take away authority, but rather it tends to focus, very appropriately it seems to me, on the needs of various children who at this time are not being served in the State of Illinois. Those are...a very brief survey of the contents of this Amendment and the Bill, and I'd certainly be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Bradley: "Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It is with real reluctance that I rise because I have so much respect for both the Senate Sponsor and the House Sponsor of this Bill. I think that the Bill, as it came over, Senate Bill 1729, from the Senate in its original form, would have been acceptable to me...would have required the Department of Mental Health and the local school districts jointly place students in need of private placement. It would have divided the cost by the schools by paying as they do now for the education related services, and then the Department of Mental Health would pay for the psychological services. As I understand it, the Amendment that was placed on in the House Education Committee changed the entire thrust of this Bill. It places the burden of all costs on local school districts. It mandates the district, if the Governor's Purchase Care Board does not approve the entire cost, to place students in private facilities and pay all actual costs. It circumvents the process of approval by the Purchase Care Review Board. It

places a new and costly mandate on school districts. It even requires school districts to pay up to a hundred dollars a month parent liability under the Department of Mental Health Code. Now this is indeed a mandated program. There have been two fiscal notes filed. The State Board of Education's fiscal note estimates an additional cost of fifteen million dollars. The second note, which was filed by Representative Schneider, estimates the cost at 8.6 million. Now, I think we have to look at the state's record of fully funding such mandates and it's not very good. The state currently owes the school districts over fourteen million dollars in special education mandates from fiscal year 1980. So I think we ought to be very careful and look at this Bill and, regrettably, I have to vote against this Bill with the Amendment that was put on in the House."

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

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Bradley: "Indicates he'll yield."

Leverenz: "I understand you amended it. Perhaps you can explain the Amendment again on the change in the source of funding. How is it done now versus how you want it in the Bill?"

Schneider: "We don't tamper at all with the funding mechanism. For example, local districts are responsible for two per capita costs, and also the other concern is room and board. Room and board is a reimbursable provision which is presently in the law and costs that are accumulated for room and board are

paid for on a current funding basis which means that they are paid three times a year. It is not a reimbursement so there is not a one year lag as there would be for a tuition. So we don't touch that provision, and to presume that room and board is going to be added as part of this cost is not accurate. The second concern is, of course, that the local costs, the two per capitass. Those figures are already in place and that means very simply, Representative Leverenz, that the district presently, if we took a gross average of...a gross count and divided the two into the cost of educating the child. Let's say the per capita was three thousand dollars per child. The school district is responsible for the first three thousand dollars. But they are responsible for that three thousand dollars whether it's a child in special ed. or whether he's regular. The next fifteen hundred dollars is the responsibility of the state. That is already in place. The next three thousand dollars is a responsibility of the local school district. That is already the law and in place. The balance of that, the difference between these two per capitass and the fifteen hundred dollars sandwiched in between and that which is over and above, becomes the responsibility of the State of Illinois. I have argued, and I think if you listened to into the early comments that the State of Illinois, because of the Purchase Care Review Board, has put restrictions on that formula and does not allow people to properly educate their child. The local school district does not bear the burden, if we are to use that phrase, any differently under this

Bill than they would under any other special ed. provision. And I would think that IEP, as it's been discussed prior, would not be doctored up or altered or adjusted because of the fear that it might cost money. So there is no change in the mechanism funding for special education."

Leverenz: "The items that are not currently supported by the Purchase Care Review Board. Can you name them again?"

Schneider: "Well, there's a rather extended list of non-allowable costs which 94-142, the federal law, would find inconsistent with their law. I don't know if the time would be properly served to go through those, but let me just say this to you. Working from the memo that you're working from, what you have to discuss is that the State Board presently does not allow certain costs. The answer to that is, by expanding the definition to include therapy, the non-allowable costs would be, to a great extent, exacerbated and reduced."

Leverenz: "Well, I'm not...not working from a memorandum, I'm just wondering why we are changing and taking away the authority or the decision-making process from the Purchase Care Review Board."

Schneider: "The reason I'm doing that is because the Purchase Care Review Board, in my judgment, it's statutory authority stands in the way and in violation of 94-142 which says that the State of Illinois, through the State Board of Education, is primarily responsible for the free and appropriate public education of that child. The Purchase Care Review Board will say, 'Well, no, no. We're not doing that.

We're only dealing with the cost.' Well, by denying certain allowable educational costs, the Purchase Care Review Board is, in effect, placing a child or not allowing a child to be placed to the appropriate level of his or her educational needs. That's why the language has been expanded. If we can't get rid of the Purchase Care Review Board, we can at least give them the language which helps define and meet the needs of that child. That's the reason for the language in the Amendment."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

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

Hallstrom: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hope I can get across to you the most important part of this Bill. Many of you have come to me when you've had parents call you when a child was going to be brought back from an institution because the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board said that the costs that they were giving to the state were not correct, that they were including psychological services. The problem with this is that the children are sent to these schools by their local school district as a result of an individual education plan because they need these kinds of services. A behaviorally disordered or an emotionally disturbed child, in order to learn, has to have psychological services or social work services or some kind of psychiatric consulted services. So that the fact that we give these already in the public schools is part of the education program. We do have school social workers, and we do have psychologists

and we do have psychiatric consultants. A child who needs that in a regular day program needs it a lot more when the school district says this child is so handicapped in these two areas that the child has to be sent outside the State of Illinois. I can't urge you enough to understand and please listen if you have ever heard from one parent because you'll find you're going to hear from many more if we don't do something to bring to the attention of the General Assembly the needs of these children. Now, these youngsters are going to stay with us, Ladies and Gentlemen, with God's help. They not going to go away. They're even going to come back to us and be in the Department of Mental Health, at great cost of the taxpayer, or the Department of Corrections, or any of our other departments where it's the same, taxpayer's money. Let's spend it up front where we can help the youngsters. It's not only morally right, but it's economically sound to take care of the needs of these children. One other issue, may I say quickly? Since I've been involved in this over twenty years, I want to tell you that my hope was to get some kind of institutional care in the State of Illinois so that we don't have to send these children all over the country. This is part of this Amendment also, that there be some kind of a study so, eventually, we can have the right kind of care at a lower cost to these children. I urge you to consider this very carefully and please vote 'yes' on the Bill. Thank you."

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

Katz: "Mr. Schneider, was the Purchase Care Review Board set

up at the time the...as part of the package of Bills that the General Assembly enacted to comply with 94-142?"

Schneider: "I'm sorry. Would you repeat the question?"

Katz: "Yes. Was the Purchase Care Review Board established as part of the package of Bills under which Illinois complied with federal law 94-142?"

Schneider: "Well, it might have been part of a package which...you want to turn it down a little bit? But it might have been part of a package a number of years ago, Harold. But first of all, the mistakes...or the mistaken assumption that we complied is, indeed, a mistaken assumption. I think we are out of compliance by having a Purchase Care Review Board that structures an educational program for a child that cannot be met. It puts you...or puts us in violation. There are a number of cases that have been brought before the Office of Civil Rights stating pretty precisely that kind of concern. So, that we acted four or five years ago...that this General Assembly acted four or five years ago represents the complexity of the issue. I have to admit, I was here as were you, that when those Bills went through that we placed our trust in various Sponsors and I still do. The fact remains is that I think now, upon reflection, we have not come into compliance with the 94-142 provision, and that can be borne out, I think, by the concern that families have shown throughout the years, since 1975, six, and so on."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the Bill very briefly."

Speaker Bradley: "You certainly may."

Katz: "Yes. A few years ago, Illinois and the other states who were faced with the choice as to whether to comply with 94-142. This was a federal law and, as federal laws usually do, they provide you with some hope of some federal money, and if you don't comply, you don't get the federal money. And so what took place was that a series of Bills was promoted here on the House floor under which Illinois agreed to comply with 94-142. There were those of us who were concerned about the cost, but we were told that we could afford to do this because of two things. First of all, the federal government was going to come up with lots of money so that they would reimburse the State of Illinois for many of these herculean expenses that we were undertaking. And then we were told that the Purchase Care Review Board would provide some reasonable controls so that the cost would not be insurmountable from the point of view of the State of Illinois and the local school district. Well, what has taken place has been that after we went ahead and passed all of those Bills over the objection of some of us and we complied with 94-142, what has taken place has been two-fold. First of all, the Federal Government has gone on an economy jag and they are...they have defaulted, in effect, on the original promises as far as funding special education whereas they had originally suggested that they would be prepared to gradually increase funding to where the Federal Government would provide forty percent of the expense of this. What's happened is that, due to

federal budgetary constraints, they haven't come anywhere near that. So we have been duped into assuming obligations that we couldn't really reasonably assume on the promise of Federal monies which Federal monies have not come. But, of course, it is too late because we have already complied. And the second part of that is that the Purchase Care Review Board was to provide some constraint so that Illinois would be able to live with the very difficult problem of what to do in these difficult situations. All of us are very sympathetic to the problem of special education children. Unfortunately, we have to be concerned about all of the children, and it is very difficult indeed, to make these decisions. Some of these costs involved as much as fifty thousand dollars a year for a child. We know that many other children who do not have these special problems are not getting adequate education either. And so this Bill, as I see it, what it is trying to do now is to erode the second basis on which we complied. The first was Federal money which the Federal government is defaulted in, and now they are trying to undercut the Purchase Care Review Board. I really don't know how Illinois schools and Illinois is going to be able to comply with 94-142. I did think we ought to recite some history though, because we're not here today as a first decision. We made some steps along the way, some steps that some of us felt were unwarranted, and I think we ought to be very careful about what we do."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. When this Bill came from the

Senate, the estimated cost was 882,000 dollars. As amended in the House and by the way we saw this Amendment very few minutes before we voted on it in Committee, the vote was 17 to 2 in favor of the Amendment. I was one of the two that voted against it because I didn't quite understand what it was going to cost. Well, the State Board of Education has estimated that it would cost 15,000,000 dollars in fiscal year '81, and in fiscal '82 it would cost the locals that...that the locals would get back 11,000,000 dollars of this. So it would end up costing them about 4,000,000 dollars. Now, Representative Schneider, who has worked very hard and diligently on this Bill estimates that it will cost 8,602,000 dollars. We also have a letter, because the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disability, we amended the powers and duties section of their Act, they tend to agree with the State Board of Education's note. Now, since the eleventh, when this Bill was heard in Committee, the Bureau of the Budget has been working on a note to figure out how much it would cost and they still don't know. So I think the concept is good, but I do think more work has to be done on this before we can vote on it intelligently. Therefore, I, reluctantly, oppose the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Yeah. Mr. Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Speaker, move the previous question, please."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question." All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye'. Oppose 'no'. The 'aye' have it. The

Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, to close the debate."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Just a few points to add...to conclude...and that would be some that relate to Representative Katz's suggestions that we created the Purchase Care Review Board to put a hammer on cost. Well, we didn't instruct the Purchase Care Review Board. We asked them to be in place for that purpose, but we don't develop the guidelines or the rules and the regs of that particular Body and those rules and regs we couldn't anticipate would be so restrictive as they are and have brought Illinois out of compliance and there are numerous cases establishing that. So I think it's one very important point to understand that what we're doing, again, to reiterate, that children who are behaviorally disordered, who can be brought back to the world of reality in terms of their lives are going to be denied the opportunity to have proper education for that purpose. And it's only because of the kinds of red flags that Representative Anderson is waving and the kind of things that a north shore liberal can stand around pouting pontifically about and argue that these poor little kids will not be cared for but don't worry. I'm wealthy enough in my area to pay for my child in the event that happens. I think we've got to go through that experience. Maybe not enough of us have had that opportunity to have, unfortunately, a child who needs assistance. And so it's nice for us to be detached on the issue, but, unfortunately, a lot of kids are going to be suffering

as a consequence of our reluctance because of the estimates of what it will cost. Everybody, as the Gentleman from Glencoe says, is sympathetic to children of these sorts but somewhere we've got to put a fiscal limit. In the meantime, that child is hurting and we aren't solving that problem. And I would hope that this Body will not act like the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board, nor like the Governor, and be insensitive to those needs. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Question is, Shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', oppose by voting 'no'. Mr. Walsh, to explain his vote."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I admire the Gentleman's compassion...the compassion of Representative Hallstrom. I, however, do not yield to that compassion and suggest that Representative Katz pretty well hit the nail on the head. The facility for establishing reasonable costs for children in this category is the Purchased Care Review Board. This Bill circumvents that Board and makes it absolutely inapplicable for this particular type of child. Now, in addition to that, it transfers from the Department of Mental Health and the Office of Education in their subsidies for special education the cost and places it pretty much on the local school boards. The local school boards can, it is true, petition for reimbursement but these reimbursements so far, as Representative Anderson pointed out, for Fiscal Year 1980 are \$14,000,000 in arrear, and I suggest to you that they will be \$29,000,000 in arrear

if this bill is passed and signed by the Governor. Now I suggest also that 94-142 did not mean...did not mean that you must take ever psychotic and psychologically maladjusted child and first educate him or her before the child is cured. Primary emphasis it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, is on curing the psychosis or whatever is wrong with the child and their education is secondary. That's common sense. I don't think the federal government in their mandate intended anything but that because to suggest that they must be educated despite any other problems would suggest that every severely retarded child in this state would then go to the state and should get whatever amount of money, whatever amount of services, whatever amount of anything from the state and be educated to almost the point of a doctorate degree. Now that's absurd, Mr. Speaker. The Bill is absurd. Let's keep some kind of order in this. I urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite, to explain her vote."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, some of us were aware that the Bills that were passed a few years ago would leave us with some problems such as those that we're trying to address right now with this measure. Unfortunately, regardless of federal law or any other kind of law, the cost of the care for these children is going to exist and a good portion of it is going to go on the public shoulders regardless of the individual laws involved. The only question here is whether we are going to allow the parents and the

school districts to cooperate, get the appropriate placement for the child earlier enough so that you have some possibility of alleviating the problem on time for them to become a productive citizen. If we don't do that, then they are probably going to be a ward of the state or under the care of the Department of Mental Health for a major portion of their lives clear into adulthood and old age. Do we want this kind of long-term responsibility financially in the shoulders of the state and the taxpayers? Or do we want to put a little more money up front and hope that we can sure them and get them on the road where they will be productive citizens. I think the educational route and the appropriate placement is a money-saver in the long run and I hope you will support this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, to explain his vote for one minute."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. It appears to me clearly that the Department of Mental Health is attempting to kill this Bill with a phoney fiscal note. In the Committee we had some good testimony from experts on this that the cost of this Bill would likely be \$4-5,000,000. That's been ballooned to 15 by the...some people who tried to torpedo this in that Committee. If we have compassion and we care we ought to look at the experts not at someone who wants to kill the Bill regardless of cost, and we ought to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, to explain her vote."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, it looks like that won't be necessary."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 97 'ayes' and 65 'nays', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority...Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Request a verification."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman requests a verification. Mrs. Chapman, what purpose do you arise."

Chapman: "Since a verification has been requested, I would ask for a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, we're going to poll the absentees. Poll of the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Davis, Donovan, Gaines, Greiman, Hannig."

Speaker Bradley: "Hannig, 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Laurino, Pechous, Schauneman, Winchester, and J.J. Wolf."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, before we...Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hoffman and Mr. Piel...Mr. Piel...wishes to be verified. Alright, before we verify the affirmative, Representative Borchers for the purpose of a greeting only he is equipped to handle."

Borchers: "That's not the truth at all. And I apologize right away for what I will mess things up, I'm afraid. Now we have a Mr. Max Ryker who is the chief electrician for the State of Illinois and a friend, Helen 'Curaci' in the balcony here. Now they have

their family visiting them from Germany. So I would like to have their Bitte Gestanden, Bitte. Bitte. Mr...Herr Kurt Laus...deinen hande. Frauen Heidi Laus...Mutter Hete Laus...und Frau Hilde Hanch...ich Welkomuren sie fur der Stat Illinois und ich...Sie geht Deutschland errinern der Stat Illinois und deinen Fraunden hier."

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

Brummer: "Just a comment that I understood that about as well as I understand most things Representative Borchers says."

Speaker Bradley: "I thought they were German. He was speaking French. Alright. Call the affirmative roll."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Alexander, Balanoff, Beatty, Birchler, Borchers, Bowman, Bradley, Braun, Breslin, Bullock, Capparelli, Catania, Chapman, Christensen, Cullerton, Currie, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Dyer, Epton, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Garmisa."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Walsh, Mr. Capparelli would like to be verified. Proceed. O'Brien wishes to be verified? O'Brien wishes to be verified."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing the poll of the affirmative. Getty, Giorgi, Goodwin, Griesheimer, Grossi, Hallock, Hallstrom, Hanahan, Hannig, Harris, Henry, Hoffman, Huff."

Walsh: "Speaker, would you get a little order and ask people to raise their hands."

Speaker Bradley: "You're absolutely right, Mr. Walsh. Will the Members please be in their seats? Everybody clear

the aisles so that he can see. And everybody not entitled to the floor, and will the pages please sit down? And Mr. Johnson from Champaign."

Johnson: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Bradley: "How is he recorded?"

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

Johnson: "Change my 'yes' vote to 'present'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record him as 'no'...to 'present'...'present'...alright. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Jaffe, Dave Jones, Emil Jones, Kane, Keane, Kelly, Klosak, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kraska, Kucharski, Kulas, Lechowicz, Leon, Madigan, Margalus, Marovitz, Matijevich, Matula, Mautino, McClain, McGrew, McPike, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, Oblinger, O'Brien, Patrick, Piel, Pouncey, Preston, Bea, Reilly, Richmond, Ronan, Sandquist, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schneider, Schraeder, Sharp, Slape, Steczo."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I rather have this than bilingual education so would you please change my vote from 'present' to 'yes'?"

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Skinner as voting 'aye'. Mr. Greiman wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Donovan, 'aye'. Mr. Davis, 'no' Proceed with the call."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the Affirmative. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Van Duyne. Vitek. Von Boeckman. White. Willer. Williamson. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourel. And, Mr. Speaker."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I was concerned to whether the state

would ever reimburse the school districts this money and the Thompson Administration probably won't. But the principle is good, and I'm going to change my vote from 'present' to 'aye' and hope we can get Governor Thompson to fully reimburse these special education costs..."

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Pierce as voting 'aye'. Questions of the Affirmative, Mr. Walsh? Turn Mr. Walsh on."

Walsh: "Beatty. Representative Beatty."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Walsh: "Catania."

Speaker Bradley: "She's not in her chair. How is she recorded?"

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, these are all 'ayes'. You need not ask. These are all 'ayes'."

Speaker Bradley: "Are you trying to hurry me?"

Walsh: "No, no."

Speaker Bradley: "I like to make sure."

Walsh: "Christensen."

Speaker Bradley: "Christensen. Is Mrs. Catania has returned. Put her back on. Mr. Bullock, for what purpose do you...he wishes to be recorded as 'no'. All right. From 'aye' to 'no', Mr. Bullock? From 'aye' to 'no'. Would that help, Mr. Walsh? You ought to check that."

Walsh: "I appreciate that."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. Who was the last..."

Walsh: "Christensen."

Speaker Bradley: "Christensen. He's not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Walsh: "Cullerton."

Speaker Bradley: "Cullerton is in the window sill."

Walsh: "Dawson."

Speaker Bradley: "Dawson is not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Walsh: "Domico."

Speaker Bradley: "Domico is not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Walsh: "Epton."

Speaker Bradley: "Epton's...Epton is not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Walsh: "Ewell."

Speaker Bradley: "Ewell is not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Walsh: "Farley."

Speaker Bradley: "Right here down in front."

Walsh: "He's right here? Okay. Garmisa."

Speaker Bradley: "Who, Sir?"

Walsh: "Garnisa."

Speaker Bradley: "Garnisa's in his chair."

Walsh: "Harris."

Speaker Bradley: "Could Mr. Rea be verified, Mr. Walsh?
Jimmy Rea?"

Walsh: "Yes, be glad to."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. Harris...is not in his seat.
How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "All right. Further questions? I took him
off."

Walsh: "You took him off."

Speaker Bradley: "Remove him."

Walsh: "Yes. Jaffe."

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

Walsh: "Klosak."

Speaker Bradley: "He's not back there. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Walsh: "Kucharski."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off and put..."

Walsh: "Lechowicz."

Speaker Bradley: "Put Mr. Beatty back on, he's returned.
Who, Mr. Walsh?"

Walsh: "Lechowicz."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Walsh: "McGrew."

Speaker Bradley: "McGrew is in the center aisle."

Walsh: "Murphy."

Speaker Bradley: "In his seat."

Walsh: "Reilly."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Walsh: "Emil Jones."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Walsh: "Richmond."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Walsh: "Ronan."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Walsh: "Slape."

Speaker Bradley: "Put Lechowicz back on, he's here. Slape is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off. Here he is. He's inside the door. Put him back on."

Walsh: "Is that Slape?"

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute. Now here's Ronan. Put him back on. Who, Mr. Walsh?"

Walsh: "That's Slape you put on and Ronan?"

Speaker Bradley: "Slape and Ronan, right."

Walsh: "Thank you. Stuffle."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in the center aisle."

Walsh: "Taylor."

Speaker Bradley: "He's over here in the side aisle."

Walsh: "Terzich."

Speaker Bradley: "Terzich. He's not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Walsh: "VonBoeckman."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Walsh: "Yourell."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Walsh: "Margalus."

Speaker Bradley: "Reilly has returned. Put him back on. Mr. Yourell is right here. Put him on."

Walsh: "Margalus, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Margalus. He is here."

Walsh: "Matula."

Speaker Bradley: "How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Walsh: "Flinn, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Walsh: "That's all, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, now Domico. He's returned.

Domico's returned. All right. And Dawson...Dawson

has returned. All right. Did I see Flinn come in?

All right. What's the count then? All right now.

VonBoeckman has returned. Epton has returned. Mr.

Gaines wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Gaines,

'aye'. Mr. Grossi, were you seeking recognition?

It's 91 'aye', 67 'no'. All right. The Bill having

received the Constitutional Majority is hereby

declared passed. Senate Bill 1739. Yes, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Grossi was looking for your attention, he

wanted...to say something, I hope to get off. There

were other people who wanted to change their votes."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Matijevich what purpose do you rise."

Matijevich: "I think we need a change of pase so I'd like to

introduce Mike McClain's mother, and we all remember

Elmo McClain, Mike's Dad, who was such a good friend

of ours...there's Mrs. McClain up there with Mike's

kid...and I...and I think Kathy's over here. Here's

Kathy McClain over here."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Peters, the Assistant Speaker this

afternoon indicated to me that he saw nobody seeking

recognition. Senate Bill 1739. Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, these people were clearly seeking your

attention. Representative Conti was waving his hands. Representative Grossi was waving his hands. They wanted some recognition before that Roll Call was announced. And you're fully aware of that. Now that is not a fair thing to do. These two gentlemen are...are seeking re-election, if their constituents found out that they had voted the way they did on that Bill, they would not come back here. Now they ought to be entitled to change their vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, you can't...you..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Walsh, I stood here and looked at Mr. Grossi, and he stood and looked at me just like he is right now and never moved, never moved....it's announced."

Walsh: "Come on, Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "It's...it's been announced, the veri...been announced it's a if it's passed it's been verified and it's been passed. Now, Senate Bill 1739. Mr. Skinner, what purpose do you rise?"

Skinner: "I move to reconsider on Senate Bill 1739, having voted on the prevailing side. And not having received a commitment from Representative Schneider, having help too bilingual education yet, 1729, excuse me...no, he voted 'aye' Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "He voted 'aye', he voted on the prevailing side."

Skinner: "I ask for a Roll Call on that, please."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I understand that we're...we have called

1739, I suggest that the Gentleman's motion is not in order at this time. And I would suggest we proceed with 1739."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, Gentleman is within his rights to...he voted on the prevailing side if he wants to move to reconsider...he's moving...Mr. Skinner moves to reconsider the...vote by which Senate Bill 1729 passed and..and he asked for a Roll Call. On that motion, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "I move that motion lie on the table."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, and he'll go get that Roll Call, now Mr. Getty moves to table Mr. Skinner's motion. All in favor, of Mr. Getty's motion, vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Skinner wants to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Yeah, if for no other reason, than there were at least three people standing on the floor, seeking the recognition of the Speaker this motion to table my motion to reconsider should be abolished. It should be put down, into the sump pump, into the septic tank..."

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

Kane: "I'm sure that if somebody was looking for the attention of the Speaker they could bring that to the Speakers attention themselves. It seems strange that other people are talking for others on the floor. I'm sure that they can handle it..."

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

Walsh: "Representative Totten wanted your...ear."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Verification please."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Totten asked for a verification. Have all voted who wish..have all voted who wish. The Clerk will take the record. Mr. Ewell... Mr. Ewell votes 'aye', oh you want to verify. Mr. Ewell wants to verify...joins..Mr. Totten in asking for a verific...Mr. Getty wants to poll the absentees. Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Christensen. Gaines. Johnson. Laurino. O'Brien, O'Brien 'aye'. No more absentees ..."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright. Now Mr. Totten, you persist. Alright. Call the Affirmative Roll."

Clerk Leone: "Poll the affirmative. Alexander. Balanoff. Beatty. Birchler. Borchers. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Dyer. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman."

Bradley: "Could Mr. Vitek be verified, Mr. Totten?"

Totten: "Yes."

Clerk Leone: "Griesheimer."

Speaker Bradley: "Piel wants to go from 'aye' to 'no'. 'Aye' to 'no.' Mr. Piel.Mr. Christensen votes 'aye'. Mr.Totten, Mr. Kelly would like to be verified. Mr. Kelly. Verif...."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll of the Affirmative. Hallstrom. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Mugalian."

Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien. Patrick. Pierce.
 Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Richmond. Ronan.
 Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Schraeder.
 Sharp. Slape. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich.
 Vitek. VonBoeckman. White. Willer. Williamson.
 Sam Wolf. Young. Yourell, and Mr. Speaker.'

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, questions of the affirmative."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, what's the count we're starting with?"

Speaker Bradley: "Clerk, what's the....89, 83."

Totten: "Beatty."

Speaker Bradley: "Beatty, not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Totten: "Capparelli."

Speaker Bradley: "He's right...sits down here."

Totten: "Chapman."

Speaker Bradley: "She's in the Speaker's office. We'll get her out here if you would like to see her."

Totten: "I'd like to see her."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, Mrs. Chapman will you come out."

Totten: "Donovan."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in the rear of the chambers."

Totten: "Farley."

Speaker Bradley: "They want to see Chapman. Farley, he's not in his seat. He's right here."

Totten: "Flinn. Flinn. Monroe Flinn."

Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his chair. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Put Beatty back on. And Van Duyne wishes to be recorded as 'aye'."

Totten: "Garmisa".

Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his chair how's he recorded."

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Totten: "Giorgi, Giorgi."

Speaker Bradley: "Giorgi? He's right by the door."

Totten: "Hannig."

Speaker Bradley: "Hannig is not in his seat. How's he recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman's.."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, he's back in McGrew's seat."

Totten: "Jaffe."

Speaker Bradley: "Jaffe is in his chair."

Totten: "Harris."

Speaker Bradley: "Harris, he's not in his seat. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Totten: "Emil Jones."

Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his seat. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Totten: "Kane."

Speaker Bradley: "Kane is in his seat."

Totten: "Leverenz."

Speaker Bradley: "Leverenz, they're pointing some place...I don't..oh..there he is. Where's Leverenz?"

Totten: "I don't see him either."

Speaker Bradley: "I don't either, take him off. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off. Emil Jones has returned, put him back on."

Totten: "McGrew."

Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his seat. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Totten: "O'Brien."

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

Totten: "Richmond."

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

Totten: "Ronan."

Speaker Bradley: "Ronan, I don't see him. Where...how's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Totten: "Sharp."

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

Totten: "Terzich."

Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his seat. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off. Ronan has returned. Put him back on."

Totten: "VonBoeckman."

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

Totten: "White."

Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his seat. How is he recorded?
...White."

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

Speaker Bradley: "There he is in the rear of the chambers."

Totten: "McPike."

Speaker Bradley: "McPike, he's not in his seat. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Totten: "Marovitz."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off and put Mr. McPike back on he has returned to the chamber. Mr. Katz what purpose do you rise?"

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

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

Totten: "Brummer."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in the rear of the chambers. Further questions?"

Totten: "No further questions."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, what's the count? Mr. Marovitz has returned, put him back on. Alright now, any other changes? Any other changes? On this question there are 83 'ayes', and 84 'nos' and Mr. Getty the Gentleman from Cook, what purpose do you..."

Getty: "Verify the negative Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Request the verification of the negative votes. You want...you wish to vote...how do you want to be recorded? Alright, now wait a minute. Put Mrs. Chapman back on. And Mr. Johnson wishes to be recorded as....oh, we never did remove Mrs. Chapman, I'm sorry. They...They accepted the fact that you

were in the rear of the cha...alright, now Mr. Johnson wishes to be recorded as what? 'No'. Record Mr. Johnson as 'no'. That gives us 83 'ayes', and 85 'nos'. He's on he's on...You're on. Alright now, we'll verify the ... call the negative."

Clerk Leone: "Poll the Negative. Abramson. Ackerman. Anderson. Barnes. Bell. Bianco. Birkinbine. Bluthardt. Boucek. Bower. Burnidge. Campbell. Capuzi. Casey. Collins. Conti. Cullerton. Daniels."

Speaker Bradley: "Would the parliamentarian come to the podium."

Clerk Leone: "Davis. Deuster. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Epton."

Speaker Bradley: "Winchester wishes to be verified."

Clerk Leone: "Ewing. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Grossi. Hallock. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Johnson. Dave Jones. Karpel. Katz. Kent. Kucharski. Leinenweber. Macdonald. Mahar. Margalus. Matula. McAuliffe. McBroom. McCourt. McMaster. Meyer. Molloy. Neff. Oblinger. Pechous. Peters. Piel. Polk. Pullen. Reed. Riley. Rigney. Robbins. Ropp. Ryan. Sandquist. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Schuneman. Simms. Skinner. Stanley. Stearney. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Sumner. Swanstrom. Telcser. Totten. Tuerk. Vinson. Walsh. Watson. Wikoff. Williams. Winchester. J. J. Wolf, and Woodyard."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, question of the Affirmative. Mr. Getty question."

Getty: "Now, what's the count now, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "83-85, 83 'ayes' and 85 'nos'."

Getty: "Mr. Simms."

Speaker Bradley: "Who?"

Getty: "Mr. Simms."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Getty: "Mr. Bluthardt."

Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his chair. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker: "Take him off."

Getty: "Mr. Bluthardt. I'm sorry. Mr. Schlickman."

Speaker Bradley: "Schlickman is not in his chair. How's he's recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Getty: "Mr. Cullerton."

Speaker Bradley: "Cullerton."

Getty: "Cullerton."

Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his seat. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him...take him off, take Cullerton off. Further questions?"

Getty: "Mr. Gene Hoffman."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off. And what purpose does Mr. Klosak rise?"

Klosak: "Mr. Speaker would you change my vote from 'present' to 'nay', please."

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Klosak as voting 'no'."

Getty: "Mr. McMaster."

Speaker Bradley: "McMasters, he's here."

Getty: "Mr. Polk."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Polk, he's not in his seat. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Getty: "Mr. Robbins...Mr. Robbins."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off and put Mr. Polk back on."

Getty: "Mr. Stearney."

Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his seat. How's he recorded? He's in Mr. Campbell's seat. I don't know why. Mr. Simms is back put him on the Roll. Simms is back, return him."

Getty: "Mr. Johnson."

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

Schuneman: "Have I been removed from the Roll, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "Not that I'm aware of."

Schuneman: "I'd like to be verified as 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Verified as a....alright as....Mr. Getty, Mr. Schuneman would like to be verified, alright?"

Getty: "Fine."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, proceed with the questions of the affirmative...or the negative. Questions?"

Getty: "Mr. Collins."

Speaker Bradley "He's here."

Getty: "Mr. Leinenweber."

Speaker Bradley: "Leinenweber is in the chambers."

Getty: "Mr. Hallock."

Speaker Bradley: "Who did you...who did...Hallock...Hallock.
That your question. He's here."

Getty: "Mr. Burns."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon?"

Getty: "Mr. Burnidge."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Burnidge is in his seat."

Getty: "Mr. Woodyard."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Woodyard. He's there."

Getty: "No further questions."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, what's the count? Okay on this
question now there are alright, Mr. Griesheimer, what
purpose do you rise?"

Griesheimer: "In the name of our next president I change my
vote to 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "From 'aye' to 'no'. Now what's that give
us? Now Mr. Garmisa has returned put him back on the
roll. On this question there are 83 'ayes' and 82
'nos'. Any changes? Any more..any changes, Mr.
Walsh? Mr. Grossi, Mr. Conti. 83 'ayes' 82 'nos' and
the motion prevails. And Mr. Skinner's motion is
tabled. Oh, come on. You got to be kidding. Senate
Bill 1739. Mr. Mahar, what purpose do you rise?"

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I request a Republican
conference in Room 118, 45 minutes."

Speaker Bradley: "Be on... back on the floor at 6:15."

Mahar: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Alright, what about the Democrats Mr.

Garnisa? I mean, Mr. Getty, Mr. Greiman. 45 minutes and the Democrats will meet in the..."

Greiman: "Room 114, Jerry."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon."

Greiman: "114."

Speaker Bradley: "114 and we need... we're going to have a perfunct here for about two minutes or three minutes for some work to be done by the Clerk. And we'll back on the floor..we'll stay in a recess until 6:15."

Clerk Leone: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, Mr. Speaker. I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of Bills of the following titles to wit: House Bill 262. 3380. 3401. 3403. 3426. 3432. 3435. 3439. 3440. 3448. 3475. 3482. 3485. 3536. 3538. 3540. 3577. and 3614, together with the attached amendments hereto which amendments I have...been printed in the Senate in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House to wit: Passed the Senate as amended, June 25, 1980. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary: Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of Bills of the following titles to wit: House Bills 3381. 3431. 3434. 3450. 3488. 3491. 3511. 3542. 3559. 3569. Passed the Senate June 25, 1980. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. First Reading, Introduction of Bills. House Bill 3616. Meyers, Kulas. A Bill for and Act to establish motor vehicles ignition inspection and maintenance program

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 25, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

by enacting certain Acts herein named. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3617. Ronan, Stanley, Slape. A Bill for an Act to amend sections of State Property Control Act. First Reading of the Bill. Messages from the Senate. By Mr. Wright, Secretary; Mr. Speaker. I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred in the House of Representatives in the passage of the Bills of the following titles to wit: House Bills 536, 1009, 1221, 3490, 3498, 3535. Together with the attached amendments hereto which I have...I have...been printed in the Senate and the adoption which I am instructed to ask concurrence to wit: Passed by the Senate as amended June 25, 1980. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any nonconcurrences? General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 921. Bradley."

Speaker Redmond: "Speaker's table...bout House Joint Resolution 105, on page 10, under the order of motions. Is Representative Bianco on the floor? Out of the record. Request for change of votes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Ewing request to vote 'no' on Senate Bill 1666. Is there objections? Representative Virginia Frederick requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1544. Is there objections? Representative Sandquist requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill...Senate Bill 1544. Is there objections?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "The first one was Senate Bill 1666, it was a verified...Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Any requests for changes that are on a verified Roll Call or if it would change the results of the Roll Call will be disregarded. Representative Birkenbine requests to vote 'nay' on Amendment 6 to Senate Bill 1828. Is there any objections? Representative Hallstrom requests to vote 'no' on Amendment 6 to Senate Bill 1828. Is there objections? Representative Dwight Friedrich requests to vote 'no' on Senate Bill 1884. Is there objections? Representative Telcser requests to vote 'no' on Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 1524. Is there objections? Representative Sandquist request to vote 'aye' on Senate Bills 1559 and 1927 and 1999. Is there objections? Representative Bowman requests to vote 'no' on Senate Bill 1726. Is there objections? Representative Sumner requests to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 1630. Is there objections?"

Speaker Redmond: "Hearing no objections, requests will be journalized. The Republican caucus is still continuing so we will stand at ease for a..about ten minutes. Representative Slape, you seeking recognition? You have any...on your mind that you want to unload?"

Slape: "Mr. Speaker, I've been requested by my former chairman and former best friend, Eugenia Chapman, to announce..to announce that...that she still has a pocket...or purse full of them tickets. That she can't unload to the Mr. Wonderful contest, Sunday. If somebody is in the earshot who is deaf, blind and dumb and wants to buy one, she said she would be glad to sell them one."

Speaker Redmond: "When are the tickets...the price going to be reduced?"

Slape: "I think she's giving them away, now."

Speaker Redmond: "Record show that Representative Walsh is in the chamber. At 6:38. On the order of concurrence. On page five. House Bill 24, Representative Huskey. Representative Huskey on the floor? Two, four, on the order of concurrence."

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you've taken me a little by surprise..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, you've been bugging me for months, you shouldn't be."

Huskey: "Well, I've had some experiences in other close of sessions, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate you calling me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "For 3106."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey, proceed."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we concur with the Senate Amendment of House Bill 24. The Amendments were agreed to by the County Clerk...the..the Clerks of the Circuit Courts Association of the state, and also of Cook County. We have no objections whatsoever to the...to the amendments of the Senate. Therefore I agree that we concur."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, Rep., I hate to impose on you to explain the amendment, but would you mind doing that for us?"

Speaker Redmond: "Explain the amendment."

Johnson: "I need to know specifically what Senate Amendment number one and Senate Amendment number two do."

Huskey: "We're getting the file out, Tim, we'll be with you in just a minute."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Coming right up, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in answering the question, Senate..the effect of the Senate Bill Amendment number one puts off the effective date of the mandatory application from October the first, 1981, to January the first of 1992. It makes the mandatory application of related provisions only applicable to Cook County. However, it leaves all the other counties to opt in if they choose. It clearly provides that the that state will pick up the cost containing and guarantee the cost of containing programs which are not met by federal monies, fees, penalties and other money. But that, it provides, if the federal programs which up...which pick up 75% of the cost terminates. The entire mandatory program including state payments, also terminates. The state payments a limited to those which are reasonably and actually necessary to maintain the program. It gives the court the power to reject an agreement between the parties to avoid mandatory payments. And that last one, I think, was put on by the request of Representative Daniels. And that's the...that's the effect of..of Amendment number one. The effect of Senate Amendment number two gives the clerk authority to invest money paid to him not deliverable...when payee cannot be found. Normal payments must be made to given payee..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson, you seeking recognition?"

Johnson: "Well, yeah....I.. you know I can read out of the Digest too. Can you tell me what...what the cost of the state share of Senate Amendment number one is going to be in dollar terms?"

Huskey: "Well, actually there has been no really dollars...agreed to. We figure roughly around a million and a half for start up monies on the state share."

Johnson: "Well, on an annual basis, there after, what will it cost the state?"

Huskey: "It shouldn't cost the state anything. It shouldn't cost it....it's mostly...it guarantees the...more or less subsidize itself."

Johnson: "It cost a million and a half to start up. Is that right?"

Huskey: "Or on the state share of it. It'll cost more because 75% of the start up cost is paid by the federal government."

Johnson: "Okay, then go ahead to Amendment number two."

Huskey: "I didn't hear you, Tim."

Johnson: "I want to know now I interrupted you. With the respect to one, now you were starting to explain Senate Amendment number two. I just wondered if you'd go over that for me."

Huskey: "Well, Senate member...number two was an amendment that was put on that if they couldn't find the person that owed that...is that the money is deposited for and they can't find the person to pay it to. That these monies be deposited at interest bearing...at an interest bearing account. And that the interest would go to the state or the county."

Johnson: "Does...does the amendment also increase the fee by the pay.."

Huskey: "It does..it does increase the fee from one dollar and a half to three dollars a month....."

Johnson: ".....paid...payer of child support. Representative Huskey wasn't that one of the problems that was raised by Judge "Chalkwiler" and others. With respect to this Bill, and that is that in a typical application of this case where you have an a...payor who is paying a very small amount doesn't have much income to pay. But is paying through the court anyway, that to assess him three dollars a month. In some cases might constitute a fairly significant portion of his total payment."

Huskey: "Well, I think the..the three dollars is a very small amount when you have to figure that the...the thousands that didn't collect the money, would have to hire a lawyer to go and collect the money. As it is now, which is...which no lawyer would even pick up the phone for three dollars."

Johnson: "...Where I guess my concern, is this. We're not against, necessarily against the Bill. But one of the concerns that was raised both in committee and by the people who spoke with me about this Bill. Is they...you might have an order and you do in a good many cases, where the payor is a low income person, of twenty or twenty-five, thirty dollars a month. And to you and I three dollars a month doesn't seem like a lot. But to somebody who is paying twenty dollars a month, that's fifteen percent of his total payment is. And it's it...my indication was that the county clerk

felt that collecting this...this amount would be more expensive to administer than the three dollars would be to pay. And that paying it in some cases would be oppressive and it would be better off just to fund the program rather than to do it by a fee program. I thought that was amended out."

Huskey: "No, that wasn't one of those things that was requested to be amended out. There's onl...but there is a provision in the Bill, that if...if the counties want to waive that collection fee, they may do so. If they feel that...and Judge "Chalkwiler" should feel that if that wasn't there, he could waive the three dollars. That's up to the court, if they want to waive it. It's not mandatory to collect it. But the provision is there for them to collect it if they desire to do so."

Johanson: "Okay, thanks for your answers."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Huskey, can you enlighten the House as to why the Senate felt that this Bill should be limited to Cook County, only?"

Huskey: "Yes, there was objections that the downstate counties didn't feel that they would be able to get into it right away. And be...and 71% of the large share of the divorce cases are in Cook County. We wanted to put St. Clair and Madison County in on this but we found out that wouldn't be constitutional. We

wanted to mandate them on it. We found out it wouldn't be constitutional but...so Cook County agreed to this. Now, your counties, every county in the state has the right to opt in to this, who received the state monies and the federal monies, if they so desire."

Satterthwaite: "But until the Supreme Court would set up some kind of rules and regulations the downstate counties would not even know what the procedure was for opting in. Is that right?"

Huskey: "But, Representative, by the time this comes up, the manda...the date this program starts is January 1, 1982. I am sure by the time that this comes up in January of 1982 the program will be all set. That's why we've extended the time on it."

Satterthwaite: "Well, but it seems to me that by extending the time line then if we should have kept the downstate counties in. So that everybody would've had uniform access to state reimbursement for these funds. Or...I don't see why we needed to do both to let the downstate counties opt out and also delay the effective date."

Huskey: "Well, this was at the request of your...your circuit court clerks. Your association of circuit clerk courts downstate where this was at there request and...and as I say I'm certain by the time the program is working. When they see the money that will be rolling in on this program. They will be in on it because all the judges and the Supreme Court is definitely endorsed this program."

Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

If I may speak to the Bill, I thought this was a good Bill when it went over to the Senate. I'm a little disturbed to find now, that we have amended it in the Senate in order to have this apply to only Cook County. And in addition to that there will be a delayed effective date. I suppose it may be better to have the program enforced in one county than in none, but I don't know what the system is going to be for downstate counties to get into the system and I am concerned that we will then have a dual system. Where in one county you have some protection for getting your support in through the clerk's office. And in other counties it remains as some kind of local discretion as to whether you have that protection or not. I still don't know how I'm going to vote on these amendments and I hope that other people will be aware of the dilemma we're in."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, a...former member of this body, I understood, often said 'If you can't get a dinner, take a sandwich.' I think that Mr. Huskey's Bill represents a very nutritious sandwich. And since we can't get that dinner. I would suggest that we vote 'yes' and take this very good sandwich that Mr. Huskey has worked so hard to bring to us today."

Speaker Redmond: "Former Member to whom Representative Chapman refers, was the former Speaker of the House, Paul Powell. Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, at the time I was county clerk of Sangamon County, that really

meant we were clerk of the county court. We had this system installed way back in 1962. The way people are talking here, you'd think it was something difficult, hard and horrendous to get going. I assure you it's very simple matter and whenever the effective date is they should be ready to go. And we shouldn't be making such a big pitch about this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Jaffe: "Yeah, Herb as you know I...I'm in support of this concept. There's only one question I really have. And that is with regard to a...I see under Senate Amendment number one, the county clerk is entitled by virtue of the person coming under this Bill to endorse the recipient's name as their agent on any federal forms requiring the recipients consent as a free condition of assistance. Could you just explain that to me?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey. Could you..."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, we can't hear back here."

Speaker Redmond: "I've just been advised that it's a 183 days until Christmas. Would you repeat your question, Mr. Jaffe?"

Jaffe: "Yeah, Herb, as you know I stand in support of this thing but I do have one question and I...I really don't understand. I see that under Senate Amendment number one, the clerk of the court is entitled to endorse the recipient's name on any federal forms requiring the recipients consent that the precondition of assistance. Could you fill us in as to what forms

we're going to permit the clerk of the court to be signing for a recipient and when would that clerk be able to do that."

Huskey: "Alright, Representative Jaffe, there are some forms that nonpublic-aid recipients have to sign in order to get the reimbursement to the county clerk...or the clerk of the circuit court. For them to be in re...reimbursed the government monies. And that is put in for that purpose. Does that...that clarify that?"

Jaffe: "Yeah, I think it does. Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Jaffe: "I...I think House Bill 24, is really an excellent Bill. It went through Judiciary I. There was a lot of work done in sub-committee on it. We had a lot of input from a lot of different people and a lot of county clerks, from some different organizations. I think...Representative Huskey is to be commended on this particular Bill. And I would urge an 'aye' vote on House Bill 24."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments one and two to House Bill 24. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Did you hear the announcement? 183 days until Christmas. Without adjournment. Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, I want to thank everyone for their help on this Bill. Every Lady in this House....."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 139 'aye' and 7 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments

one and two on House Bill 24. Representative Collins, alright Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Some of us were wondering if we were going to be here late tonight if we should order out..."

Speaker Redmond: "We will be here, in my judgment at least as late as we were last night."

Winchester: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker....many..many Members were inquiring about the Fellowship dinner because we are such hard working members of the legislature we were going to be moving on to our business throughout the night. As the Apostle Paul was converted on the road to Damascus. We have decided to convert our Fellowship dinner into a breakfast. And so I would like to announce to all the Members that you are cordially and warmly invited to join us for our Fellowship breakfast tomorrow morning. From 8:30 to 9:30 at the Narrow Way Inn Restaurant. Now very briefly, I would like to introduce the people who are making this breakfast possible for us. And first the host who is taking care of the financial side of this, Mr. Steve 'Byfield', who is right here. And then the Pastor of the Christ Church of Lake Forest, Reverend Tony 'Allstrom' who has worked not only with our Legislative Prayer Breakfast Group but with the Chicago City Council, Tony. And we are going to be entertained with joyful music for the Lord, by Mrs. Janet 'Wacker', of Lake Forrest. Who has through her career been a nightclub entertainer and singer. She

is a converted Christian, and she is a Gospel singer, spends a lot of time traveling around the country. And she's going to bring us beautiful music in the morning. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House you're all invited to join us for breakfast, tomorrow morning as I say at 8:30 at the Narrow Way Inn. Which is a block from the Capitol. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "On page six, the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 2924. Representative McClain. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If we've got...question. If we've got so much to do, why are we on the Order of Concurrence? Why don't we get on some..."

Speaker Redmond: "Because that's a good way to get people here."

Totten: "I think we...you got enough here, that we can start going."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, when you're Speaker, why then you'd make that decision. Representative McClain."

Totten: "....for trying to be Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "You don't think he's kidding, he came back in the Speaker's office and measured the drapes. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House with leave I'd like to take Senate Amendments number one and two at the same time. They're....it will save time."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? No objection. Go ahead."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Senate a number....Senate

Amendment number one to House Bill 2924, to the appropriation for the Appellate Defender's office. Reduced the sum of that appropriation \$162,000. 133,700 came from Personal Services, and the rest came from the affiliated sums of money. The second amendment increased the amount of money for the Appellate Defender's office \$230,000. Which would be contractual goes into the Attorney expenses, which will help clear up the back log that the Appellate Defender's office has. The Senate felt strongly instead of giving them full-time personnel just to let them have enough contractual, so they can clear up the back log in one year. And I move for a concurrence on Senate Amendment number one and two, House Bill 2924."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Questions on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments one and two to House Bill 2924. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had a question I wanted... Sponsor could... is this higher than it was introduced or less? I couldn't make that out."

McClain: "It's... higher. But it's... it's not taken from Personal Services which would've been full-time personnel we'd be reappropriating every year. All this did is contractual so they can clean up the back log in one year."

Totten: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Take the Record. On this question there's 110 'aye' and 17 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments one and two to

House Bill 2924. 3048. Representative Grossi."

Grossi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment number one to...reduces the Prisoner Review Board budget by \$3,900. I've been advised that the Prisoner Review Board can live with this reduction. Therefore I move to concur with Senate Amendment number one."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment one to House Bill 3048? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all vote who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, it's 121 'aye', and 9 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment one to House Bill 3048. 3070. Representative Anderson. Representative Reilly. Can't see Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to hear Senate Amendment one and two together."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objections. Proceed, sir."

Anderson: "Alright, Senate Amendment number one, deals with anticipation warrants. The local board upon issuing such certificates shall within 30 days give written notification to the appropriate regional superintendent. And the superintendent upon..when he receives the money will pay directly the warrants. Rather than pay it to the school district who will then pay the warrants. This makes the bond more saleable, I mean the warrants more saleable. And amendment number two was a technical amendment that deletes outdated language. I move to concur."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "The Gentleman yield for a question."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Leinenweber: "You say Senate Amendment number two deletes outdated language. It seems to delete the requirement that the state aid claims to be reduced, for each day less than the number of school days required by the act. Is that the effect of Senate Amendment number two?"

Anderson: "No, Senate Amendment number two, are you looking at.."

Leinenweber: "I'm looking at the Digest."

Anderson: "Well, I'll read you the lines that it deletes. 'If for any school year before the 1975-76 school year. Any school district fails to provide the minimum school term specified in 1019.'"

Leinenweber: "Alright, is this only applies to the...I mean this is something we put in the law sometime ago? And you're...."

Anderson: "Yes sir."

Leinenweber: "Alright, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendments one and two to House Bill 3070. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record, on this question there's are 149 'aye', and 2 'no'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments one and two to House Bill 3070. On the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, on page three, appears Senate Bill 1739. Representative

Madigan on the floor? Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1739. A Bill for an Act in relation to compensation of workers for job related injuries and diseases. Third reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane, Representative Conti, Representative Telcser and Representative Dwight Friedrich, will you please go to the Speaker's office for a conference with Representative Monroe Flinn...and Al Greiman? Representative Madigan...1739...oh, pardon me. Representative McPike. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 1739 is the Bill which we debated at great length last evening. It encompasses several reforms in the worker's compensation system. We adopted almost all of the provisions that the Senate placed in the Bill. Through House Committee and through Second Reading last night, certain changes were made in the Bill. All of you may not agree with every provision of this Bill, but this is the product of the Legislative process. As the Bill moved through Second Reading, we all had an opportunity to offer Amendments, to vote as we saw the issue. Now the Bill is on Third Reading. It will bring to the employers of the State of Illinois reforms in the system that will eliminate abuse of the system that we have read so much about. As I suggested earlier, you may not agree wholeheartedly with this Bill, you may not agree with every provision, but it is a good Bill, it is a good reform. I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the

Majority Leader labels this as a reform Bill. It's better, as somebody said to me earlier today, it's a deform Bill. I don't like to get cute with terminology on the floor but that's precisely what it is. This Bill, in the present form, is going to not only...it will not only reform, it will cost the employers across this state a lot more for worker's comp. than the present law provides today. And you know what has happened to worker's comp. since 1975. We attempted to amend this Bill last night. We were not successful. We wanted some reform. We tried to bring some sense and orderliness into the system. We weren't successful. I'm suggesting to this House that the best thing to do is to kill this Bill, vote 'no' on the Bill, go back to the drawing board and come up with some reform that will mean some reform to the State of Illinois. And, therefore, I suggest that the best thing to do is to vote red on this Bill and try it again another day."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Tuerk: "I further suggest..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I'd like to...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1739 is the story of lost opportunity. Lost opportunities for the workers of Illinois to have more jobs, lost opportunities for the General Assembly to give employers relief from the high cost of workman's compensation premiums. We had a Bill, Mr. Speaker, that would have continued to provide benefits to workers with job related injuries at levels much better than those other states still

have, and still reduce the cost that business is providing for the job. We had a Bill, Mr. Speaker, that would have set medical standards so workers would know how much compensation to expect if they suffered a job related injury. We had a Bill, Mr. Speaker, that would have eliminated abuses in the workers compensation system, such as the wide-spread practice of doctor shopping. We also had a Bill, Mr. Speaker, that would have made a serious effort to improve our steadily deteriorating employment situation in Illinois. We also had a Bill, Mr. Speaker, but now we have nothing, nothing more than an empty election year charade, thanks to the efforts of your Party. The workers of Illinois need jobs. And the employers who provide those jobs need relief from the high premiums that they now pay. All the pamphlets and all of the booklets and the cosmetic changes in the world such as those that have been outlined in Senate Bill 1739, as it now stands, won't cure that illness. But Democrats will have nothing to do with provisions that go beyond election year chicanery. Last week, for the first time in many years, House Republicans adopted a caucus position. We decided to take a stand in an unshakeable stance on worker's compensation reform because we felt it to be of utmost importance to the workers and the employers of the State of Illinois. We are voting 'no' today because we will have no part of an election year charade designed to fool the voters, to fool the workers and to try to fool the employers. It's designed, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, to fool the people into believing that you're

providing sincere... and that you're sincere about trying to provide jobs. Several weeks ago, when I relinquished the Sponsorship of Senate Bill 1739 to the Majority Leader, I made it clear that I was very skeptical of the Democrat's professed sincerity on meaningful worker's compensation reform. I said at that time that I would believe the Democrats were interested in meaningful reform when I saw it enacted. I released those Bills to Mr. Madigan because it was the only chance that we had to achieve some reform this Session. And we all know what happened last night. We have it here now, House Bill...Senate Bill 1739, relief for workers and employers by task force. The Democrats answer to the cries for more jobs and reduced worker's premium comp...compensation payments. Let's publish some pamphlets and booklets and maybe the proposal will go away. That's been the answer from the Democrat side. But that won't happen, Mr. Speaker. The problems deserve the attention now. And the facts and the figures are available to those who are sincere enough about trying to do something. Anyone who has been around this Chamber for a few years has heard the litanies of the horror stories. We're sympathetic to the workers, Mr. Speaker, and we want to see that they receive just and reasonable compensation in benefits. But we also have to be concerned about the horror stories of another sort. Those stories involve lost jobs, lost paychecks, longer unemployment lines and empty factories. If I voted to gut what was a meaningful Bill yesterday, I don't think that I would want to go out and face

job-conscious citizens of Illinois over the next few months. The citizens of Illinois will decide whether keeping jobs in Illinois and improving our state's ability to attract new jobs through worker's compensation reform is an important priority. And I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that they will answer with a resounding yes. And I would also urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

I rise in opposition to House Bill...Senate Bill 1739.

One of the previous Speakers indicated that this Bill contains several reforms. Well quite frankly, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill fails to reform one of the most important parts and one of the most significant problems that we have in worker's comp. in Illinois, and that is dealing with the Industrial Commission. The...we must review the procedures and the policies of the Industrial Commission and the way they are presently operating over there if we are going to have any real reform in this state in worker's comp. I call your attention to an article that appeared in the Chicago Sun Times yesterday. I know that numerous articles have appeared in the newspapers downstate, in Rockford, Joliet, Peoria, East St. Louis and so forth. The article in the Sun Times dated, Tuesday, June 24, 1980, New Workers Comp. Laws Needed By The BGA. The Better Government Association charged Monday that the Illinois Worker's Compensation System encourages fraud which ultimately must be paid by the businesses and the taxpayers in the State of Illinois. They also indicated that there

should be several reforms and this was just with the most speedy inquiry into the compensation procedures over there. They required that the State Commission publish its judgments. They also suggested that we institute an adequate record keeping system over there. Ladies and Gentlemen, we must begin to investigate these comp...the Industrial Commission in the State of Illinois if we're going to have any meaningful reform. There is a House Joint Resolution 108, which I hope you will support at a later date, which sets up a bipartisan board to investigate just this matter. I cannot support this Bill for two reasons. There are two Amendments that have been adopted to this Bill that I feel will repeat 1975 all again and do nothing but increase the premiums for worker's comp. in the State of Illinois. One of them is the hearing Amendment and the second Amendment that will increase the premiums, in my estimation, is the previous injury Amendment. For those reasons, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would encourage you to vote 'no' or 'present' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree with the last Speaker. What we have before us tonight is an increase in the cost of workman's compensation to the business community, and as a result, the consumer in the State of Illinois. Ever since I've been down here I have consistently been for workman's compensation reform, the meaningful reforms. This we do not have in the Bill before us tonight. Senate Bill 1739, as amended, as we have

before us, contains no relief for employers and is going to raise the workman's compensation premiums throughout the State of Illinois. And as a result, the employers, the business community and the consumers are going to suffer. I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike. McPike."

McPike: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The biggest PR issue the Republican Party has had since I've been in the Illinois House is worker's compensation. And they've...they've won the PR battle, there's no doubt about it. They've convinced the public that worker's compensation in this state is one of the highest in the Nation. The news media consistently refuses to publish the facts. We rank twenty-fourth in the country, twenty-fourth, not first, not last, we rank twenty-fourth. The average cost of worker's comp. in the country is two dollars and sixty-two cents. The average cost of workers comp. in Illinois is two dollars and fifty-seven cents. We're five cents before the average for the country. We recognize that there are some abuses to the system. We've set out to correct some of those abuses. In early May the Governor sent to the Senate, specifically to the four Senators sponsoring 1739, a letter commending them for their actions to date and asked them to do seven things. We have done six of the seven things the Governor asked. He asked that we require written and published decisions, we have done that. He asked that we address ourselves to the unlimited choice of

medical, we have done that by limiting it to emergency plus two. He asked us to eliminate recreational rehabilitation programs and transportation from worker's comp, we did that. He asked us to eliminate the minimum awards for certain injuries such as fractures, loss of a spleen, etc., we did that. He asked us to redefine part-time worker's wages, we did that. And finally, he asked us to address ourselves to hearing loss standards and we did that. We did that by...by adopting the 90 decibel standard which the IMA and the Chamber has asked us to do. And, in short, we did everything the Governor asked, except adopt standards, and we believed a more practical approach was to allow standards to develop over a period of time. What we didn't do and what the Republican Party claims as their reforms, what we didn't do, we failed to adopt the most regressive, disgraceful and even criminal Amendment that I have seen since I have been on the floor. And particularly, Amendment #4 last night, which was their answer to the hearing Amendment, was nothing less than criminal, wipe out six hundred pending cases. If you are caught in an explosion and you lose both eardrums, you can't be compensated. Now how ridiculous can you get? How can you possibly call that a reform? What else did they want to do? Amendment #7, wanted to wipe out occupational disease in Illinois. Now isn't that a wonderful reform? Isn't that a decent way to approach this issue? Wipe out occupational disease under our law. And what else did they finally want to do as meaningful reform, reduce the amount of

money going to an injured worker who is going to be permanently partially disabled the rest of his life. That's what some Members of the Republican Party believe is meaningful reform. That's what they want to do so that we won't be twenty-fourth in cost in this country, but we will be fiftieth in cost in this country and the Republicans will then finally be happy when they have destroyed the dignity of the injured worker. And that is what they mean by reform. This Bill, in its present shape, is a decent approach, is a responsible approach to try to bring meaningful reform to a very complex and difficult system. I ask for an 'aye' vote on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is not a decent reform. What this Bill is, in its current state, is an increase in worker's compensation costs for the employer community in Illinois. The Democrat Party has responded this year, just as they have every year since I've been here, and I came here in 1975. And you know, we had so many Democrats that year that we had to seat them on this side of the aisle. We had one hundred and one Democrats. Do you remember? But every time we have an election we keep losing Democrats. And I think we're going to lose some more next time over this very issue. You're not listening. Nobody is listening to what the business community is saying. You're not listening when employers tell you, 'We're going to have to enlarge our factories, we're going to have to expand our business, but we can't do it here. We

can't do it here because you won't permit it. It's not economically possible to do it here'. So we have Caterpillar Tractor Company. It's not the largest, one of the largest employers in the State of Illinois. They can't expand here in Illinois. They're required to make a profit so they need to go to other states where they find the business climate is more livable than it is here. You...you've pulled this charade every year since 1975. You've asked the business community what they want and you've picked the lowest items on their priority list. You've given a little bit and hope that the issue will go away. Well it didn't go away this year. This morning's headlines in newspapers throughout the state read like the one I have in my hand. It says, 'House Democrats narrowly kill GOP Amendments to Worker's Compensation Bills'. That's the message that's going home. That's the message that comes through with the passage of this Bill. This Bill should be defeated. We should go back and begin all over and really bring about some reform in this rotten system that we have here in Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Who's going to close, Madigan or McPike? Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm privileged to close on Senate Bill

1739 and I would like to address a few of the comments that were made earlier this evening on this question by a couple of the Members. Number one, the previous Speaker mentioned Caterpillar Tractor Company. Caterpillar Tractor Company is a multi-national corporation. They have plants in other states. They also have plants in other Nations. And do you know what the best kept secret in the State of Illinois is? Last year, 1979, and continuing this year, Caterpillar opened a plant in Pontiac, Illinois. That's about the greatest...the greatest kept secret in this state. Now I don't know if you Members realize it. Caterpillar opened a new plant in Pontiac, didn't they, Representative Ewing? You don't see any news item on that issue, but they did so. I don't know why everyone wants to keep it a secret but it's a very important progressive move and I'm glad they did it. Another Member mentioned the decibel level for hearing loss causation. It happened to be a great Amendment in my estimation. And, according to the Director Castle of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs Correspondence, this particular provision that says that manufacturers will not have to retool at the 85 decibel level is a savings of 1.7 billion dollars to the manufacturing community. This amounts to fourteen hundred dollars per manufacturing employee and ninety-five thousand per manufacturing plant in the state. If, in fact, we didn't do that, the manufacturers of the state would have been straddled with an 82 decibel hearing loss provision and as 85 decibel hearing loss causation movement. That would

have been very expensive. If you don't adopt this, the manufacturers could be faced with that because that particular provision is on the Governor's desk. I'd like to point out also that the twenty-five percent reduction in the second injury fund, now called the cumulative injury fund, has to be decreased in premium rates to the manufacturers of the state of Illinois. And I find it very interesting that Members on the other side of the aisle are opposed to those six of the seven change...changes presented by Representative McPike. I think it is a movement. I think everyone if wants to be honest that the number one issue was not the reduction in benefits for the employee...injured employees of the State of Illinois. It was the fact that manufacturers don't want to put rubber bushings on their punch presses. They don't want to totally insulate a plant with six to eight to twelve inches of insulation so that the hearing problem does not occur and they don't get caught in that vice called additional claims. That particular Amendment saves the employers of the State of Illinois 1.7 billion dollars from a department of this administration. That did not come from management. That did not come from Labor. That comes from the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, whose job it is...is to get businesses to continue to expand and to come into this state. It is not a partisan report, I have it for anyone who would like to have it in their possession, and it is here and I think they are correct in their evaluation. Therefore, I recommend most highly that the best kept secret in the

state, Caterpillar's expansion and development of their new plant in Pontiac and this worker's comp. Bill be passed. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Ebbesen. One minute to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I'd just like to call the attention of the House in explaining my 'no' vote. That if you look at the Senate sponsorship of Senators D'Angelis, Donnewald, Shapiro and Rock...and it came out of there in the form coming from the Senate with forty-nine affirmative votes and three against. And what we've taken out to make this a weaker bill are strict limitations on attorney fees on uncontested cases, the right of an employer to request an impartial medical expert in cases of a conflicting medical testimony, and most importantly, the House Democratic Amendment #1 removes all reference to the deductions in compensation for pre-existing injuries. And I'm here to tell you Gentleman, voting for this Bill would...if it gets out of here and goes back to the Senate, I think they're going to take a personal affront to this with that type of leadership that sent it over here. I think we ought to defeat this Bill right now, take it back to Second Reading and put those Amendments back on and...and some meaningful piece of legislation. I encourage everyone to vote 'no' on this piece of legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Karpziel."

Karpiel: "Yes, in explaining my 'no' vote on this...Mr. Speaker...oh, I was shut off there for a minute...is my...I am constantly amazed at how the Democrats can reverse logic. The entire business community has been looking forward or looking for and working for workman's compensation reform. I've had numerous letters from Caterpillar that Representative Mautino is talking about from many other...businesses and manufacturing industry in my district and the rest of the state asking for a reform. The Bill that...1739 that the Democrats have...have passed or are going...hopefully not to pass...or will pass is one that the business community is against. Now how can the Democrats say that they have, and are quoting in saying that they are reforming, and doing all this for the business community when they have not listened to one single, solitary thing the business community has said, when they are representing labor, the Trial Lawyers Association and who knows what else, and then they say that this Bill is...is going to help the business community. I just can...as they say, totally amazed at their reverse logic."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, we may have reverse logic but we have some logic on the Democratic side. Look at what the Republicans offered, no hearing losses, no occupational diseases for all intents and purposes, no aggravation, but the benefits for the maimed, the blind, the amputees, ridiculous, shameful, normal for Republicans. The only reforms are Democratic reforms. McPike was absolutely right. We

did everything possible to meet what the Governor asked for and the Republicans even voted against that, with a few exceptions and I applaud those people. I'm proud to be a Democrat. I said that in 1977 on this issue, I say it tonight. I would rather stand up for the people that need this help than stand up for the people who lie about what they want in the business community and who don't give a damn about injured workers. If you don't vote 'yes' then you ought to go home and tell them the truth, you really don't want to pass a damn thing, you want a campaign issue."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson. Representative Steele."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think it's unfortunate that this Bill which is supposed to be a reform Bill absolutely does nothing to help the job climate here in our state, in fact, makes our present situation worse. You know that it's really a tragedy that when the largest employer in our state has to start leaving and buying land in Wisconsin, we know there's something wrong. You know when the workman's compensation rates in Illinois are twice as high as they are in Wisconsin and Ohio, there's something wrong. You know that when one of the largest employers in my district has just recently had to start building a plant in Tennessee and hiring three thousand workers in Tennessee rather than in Illinois, there's something wrong. And you know there's something wrong when the best transportation system in the Nation is here in Illinois, when the best skilled workers are here in

Illinois and when we have the ideal geographical location in the United States and we're still losing jobs, there's something wrong. There's definitely something wrong. This Bill is not taking care of what's wrong. It's not bringing us in line with other states where we are losing jobs to. It's not bringing us in line, in fact, it's going to create unemployment lines that are longer. And because of that it's a tragedy that we're not able to produce a better Bill than this, a tragedy for Illinois, a tragedy to the job climate in this State. And I certainly...proudly vote "no."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm astounded, I'm dumbfounded, I'm amazed and I can't believe what I'm hearing from the other side of the aisle. If any of these Gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have been down here any length of time, and all have been down here at least a second year, some of them twenty years, and if they don't know the legislative process by now, that if they don't know that this Bill is very much alive if they give it a 'yes' vote, that's it's got to go to their counterparts in the Senate, their Party or Sponsors of the Bill over there with the Majority Party. They've got...are going to have a lot of input. The bill can be improved much more than it is now. And if you now desert the manufacturers when we have worked so hard to assist, and believe me I've assisted you in helping the manufacturers, but if you desert me now, then I don't think you even deserve to come back in the

fall...or in January. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, there are...mentioned a couple of times in the closing in the Caterpillar plant in Pontiac. I would say to you there's probably two reasons that that plant is there. First of all, they know that they have at least two-thirds of their delegation is in support of business down here. Second, they know that they have good workers in Pontiac. And I would say in parting, those of you who would and might have had the Caterpillar plants that have gone to Indiana and to Wisconsin, it's great to have a Caterpillar plant. You ought to try to encourage business in your community. You'll find it does a lot for your unemployment rate.

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I find myself in an embarrassing position and for once in my life agreeing with Representative Ryan. He indicated this was an election year charade. I could not agree more. It has become apparent that the Republicans want to maintain the charade, or they want to maintain the posture that they are not...they...the Democrats are not interested in reform. They want to maintain and holler to the press and to the media that this Bill contains no reform, when in fact, it contains twelve significant items of reform. Six of the seven which were recommended by the Governor in his letter to the Leadership. But they would not rather have the reform. They would rather have the election year charade. It is not a Bill of lost

opportunity. If their Party and the Senate does not agree with it, under which sponsorship it still exists, they can take care of it in the Conference Committee. However, I think the bill in its current shape has twelve significant reforms which will be of benefit to the employment community. The final bottom line, I guess is, that if maintaining my seat here means that I have to reduce the cost of maintaining my seat here means that I have to reduce the benefits of someone who has had a total loss of a leg from fifty-four thousand, one hundred dollars to thirty-five thousand, one hundred dollars, if I have to maintain my seat here for that nineteen thousand dollar loss that's going to occur to that injured worker and his family..of nineteen thousand dollars, then I don't want my seat here. I'll go back to practicing law full-time, but I will not have it on my conscience that I have cut the benefits by nineteen thousand dollars to that injured employee and his family. I vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I believe there's one factor the last Speaker left out of that. He forgot to take out the attorney fee, the thirty-three percent. But the other thing I want to mention...the other thing I would like to call your attention to, if this is really a Democrat Bill, it takes 89 votes to pass a Bill and according to the last Roll Call I saw, there are 89 Democrats over there. Where are they?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich; "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let's really put this into focus. Because last year I think all of us heard the Governor and all of us heard the...saw the press releases where the only reforms that we could hope for would be through the agreed Bill process. The Governor has tried it. We found out it worked on unemployment compensation insurance. There is no reason why it cannot work on worker's compensation reform also. All of the editorials that I have seen have said that the only reforms that we can hope for ought to be gradual. Now if you look at what's been happening, we found even the Governor has...because of the sponsorship on some Bills and because of the votes that they hope for, thought they would get greedy. They thought that they could again violate the agreed Bill process and become greedy and get too much. Now all of a sudden they find that that cannot happen. The truth is that you people over there have had a caucus and someone told me that for the first time in history, you're to lock yourselves in a caucus position. Now if you have done that, and I stand proudly here and tell you that in my fourteen years the Democratic Party has never locked themselves in in a caucus position. And if you really have any hope for any reform, you know that the only way that you can hope for it is by passing this Bill out. Because this is not the end of the road. Now I heard the Minority Leader speak on the floor of the House and say that if you have ever been in this Chamber for any number of years, when he said that I was wondering what Chamber he meant, because I thought

he meant the Chamber of Commerce, because many of us have heard him on the floor of the House and I can...I've said many times, I can vote everybody's switch here and I usually tell everybody's words also. That speech didn't sound like George Ryan's speech. That sounded like it was written by Lester Brann from the State Chamber of Commerce. Now if you want...if you want Les Brann and the State Chamber of Commerce to run the State Legislature, go ahead and stay where you're at. But if you want some reform, get on board. This is the only...this is the only show going. It's the only train to hop on board, otherwise there will be nothing. But don't blame it on us."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it seems to me that the ship, the shining and hopeful ship of worker's reform now lies dead in the water. That is true because it was torpedoed last night. And it was torpedoed with salvo after salvo fired against those Amendments and the only Amendments that had any real meaning and would bring any real relief to the business community and the State of Illinois. There is no cause for joy here as I see it. The results of the work last evening not only bring no relief to business here in Illinois but bring increased hardship and cost to the employers. The action taken, leaves us worse off than we were back in 1975. We'll continue to see businesses leave or think about leaving. We'll continue to see businesses not encouraged to come into the State of Illinois. So I suggest, Ladies and Gentlemen, that all...the only

choice we have at this point is to vote no on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was beginning to wonder if my light was working up there. It's been on there since Representative Huskey had his Bill up."

Speaker Redmond: "You're not as pushy as Huskey."

Griesheimer: "No, I'm not as pushy. I think that our leader distinguished himself in his moderate remarks. This is not a charade. This is a fraud being perpetrated upon all of the people of the State of Illinois. I'd like to say it's the Democratic Party, but it's on wholly the Democratic Party because there was some clear-thinking people over there that tended to vote with some of these Amendments. The fact of the matter is is that most of you people on the other side have never paid a premium on a workman's compensation bill. You've either been on dole as an employee working for some union or have been working as a dole employee of the government so long that you don't know what's going on. You look up there in the balcony and you see the IMA. You see the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce. It's the big business versus the labor unions. Well, you're wrong. John Matijevich go home and go into the neighborhood gasoline station and find out that the little guy with two employees is about ready to go under in this state. He cannot afford these excruciatingly high premiums for workman's compensation. Don't give us this bull roar that you're lowering or doing anything for premiums today. This, in fact, is not a charade. It is entirely a

fraud. I suggest the only way that we're ever going to solve this problem in this state is to put some of these Legislators to work where they have to meet a payroll. What they know what paying a premium really is. Quit working for the City of Chicago and the County of Cook and go to work and make an honest dollar and then maybe you'll find out what the problem is. You're killing the business climate in this state. It's getting worse. It's getting worse by the day. And so far as we're all concerned in this state, the best thing the voters could do is turn you all out office in the next election. . . . Not just for Republicans, but for the people that voted to do something about this problem."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock. Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The previous speaker made remarks as it relates to the source of employment for people on this side of the aisle. Fortunately, some of us do not work for the City or the County of Cook and have not been on the public payroll, but in that respect some of us had not had the misfortune of the previous speaker where the voters obviously made a wise choice and let him practice law forever."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we can see exactly what the mentality of the Democratic philosophy is. Let's look what the Democrats have given to us. The National Administration has given us double-digit inflation.

They've given us double-digit unemployment and now in the State of Illinois they want to give us triple-digit increases in workman's compensation. I suggest to the Party on the other side of the aisle that if you're interested in the people you wouldn't have voted against Amendments that were offered last night. I suggest that your mentality and the type of political instincts and what you have told the people of Illinois regarding the economy is nothing other than political compost."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "One of the saddest commentaries on the Bill is the man that gets hurt. Five years, he hasn't collected yet. That's your figures, your facts. It's my figures. Since I've become a Representative I have found many of these people that cannot get a workman's compensation hearing and applying. They go hire a lawyer. The lawyer says, 'Well, we'll wait awhile'. The ones that I was lobbied hardest on these workman's compensation law was not the Manufacturers Association, was not the insurance companies, but the Trial Lawyers said, 'Don't take away our goodies'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I look at this thing a little bit differently. I agree with everything our side has said, but I do not think they look far enough ahead in the future. And I do. That's why I am where I am. And I don't mean this Legislature either. So I'm going to predict to you that I'm going to vote for you, but the reason is because I'm contributing to the other utter and the

control of this House next January. And anybody want to bet on that, I'll bet you because you're going to lose and we're going to win. And based on that."

Speaker Redmond: "It's against the law to bet, Representative Borchers. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, as usual like a lot of the issues in the General Assembly, the facts are distorted by the emotions. You've heard Representative McPike give you all of the cost savings and the rank of Illinois and the rank of the states and the cost for workman's compensation and other costs, but what's happened is the people that should be indicted tonight instead of the General Assembly is the Illinois Chamber of Commerce and the Illinois Association of Manufacturers for the lies they spewed since 1975. They didn't tell you in Illinois that there was a gain of 300,000 jobs in Illinois. No loss in jobs. A net gain of 300,000 jobs and that's from the Department of Revenue. We're the number one state in per-capita income. We're the number one state in expendable income after you pay your state, local, and federal taxes. We're the number one exporting state in the nation. You think we're the number one state in the nation because we're idiots? It's because we've got the most enlightened General Assembly in the 50 states. That's why we're the number one state in the nation. And the lies you've heard about workman's comp.... The workman's comp. was written because of the employers...abuse of the employer that was injured on the job. It wasn't a...it wasn't a panacea or it was not give-away program. It was done because of the employers that

were injured on the job and because the...the Illinois Manufacturing Association last year give you statistics. There were more businesses coming in Illinois than left. And there was a net gain in jobs. And I say again that the people that should be indicted is the Illinois Association of Manufacturers and the Illinois Chamber of Commerce for the lies and for telling the other 50 states and for giving Illinois a dirty, black name. They're the ones that should be indicted, not the Democratic Party."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, notwithstanding the political election year speeches by the Republican Members of the House, the record clearly shows, the record yesterday and those of you who have mentioned numbers must recognize, of course, that there are 89 Democrats in this House and 88 Republicans. And mention was made of a Republican caucus for the first time in the history of some individuals who serve in this House. It was a binding caucus. Yet in reviewing...yet in reviewing each of the Amendments that were presented yesterday, if anybody can find that there were 88 Republicans voting for each of those Amendments that only required one Democrat to switch over and vote for those Amendments, then you would have been successful. The fact of the matter is, Ladies and Gentlemen, that many of the Amendments that would have changed completely the Democratic sponsored a Bill to what it was, the DeAngelis Bill when it came from the Senate to the House, was withdrawn last night. Now when one Member

of this House was allowed to vote on a Bill that deleted everything after the enacting clause and placed the Republican Bill in place. That Amendment was withdrawn by the Minority Leader of this House because they really don't want worker's compensation to become a reality. Because if they did, they would take away the only campaign issue that they wrongly think they have. But I would suggest that this is a matter of record. It's always been a matter of record. It's now a games number and if anybody can show me where all 88 Republicans voted on all of the Republican Amendments to make the Bill what the Republicans thought it ought to be, then I'll change my vote to no. But I have the record Roll Calls in front of me. I intend to use them and that will clearly show that not 88 Republicans voted for the Republican Amendments, but in some cases only 72, 73, and on seven of the Amendments that were adopted 6 Republicans voted with the Democrats to either table the Amendment or to pass the Amendment. So the record is there, Ladies and Gentlemen. The record of numbers. If 98 Republicans had voted as they're talking today, you would have the Bill that you think you ought to have. But you didn't do that in spite of the binding effect of your caucus. So I suggest that notwithstanding the political speeches in this election year, you're really not sincere. You think you have an issue. The issue will backfire. The issue will not be there come November because this House will remain Democratic as it is today."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my vote I don't know how anybody on this floor of this House could be voting green and saying they're doing something for the business climate of the State of Illinois which is down at the worst it's ever been in history. Now, we talk about and we can all name several companies that have even moved out or built new plants. We'll take Deere and Company. The largest farm machinery manufacturer in the world has its home office in Illinois and yet they've built five new plants, large plants, and every one has been out of state. And talking to those people and the heads of it, the reason they have not built in Illinois that the cost of business is too high. And I would think that this would have something to say about the insurance being ripped off. When they're self-insured and they still say the workman compensation of being self-insured is too high to employ people in Illinois. And let's go on and have the thousand of other small businesses that have either closed up, they're not big enough to move out and go to other places, and let's think about the small business that employ maybe five to twenty-five people. How many of those have had to close up? How many of us have talked to people recently that say if they don't make a change in it they are going to close out. Let's do something for the working man and this legislation will not do it. I would hope that we'd all give a second thought on this and vote for what is right for the people of the State of Illinois and the working man who is losing

jobs over this type of compensation that we've had in the past. And let's all vote no."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, having spent 25 some odd years in the labor movement and about 15 to 16 in management and looking back prior to 1975 and being involved in local government, what happened to the people that were on the issues then that were drawing the benefits under the workman's compensation. They finally wound up at the taxpayer's expense. They were either on public aid or the local supervisors were taking care of them. After 1975, it put the worker in a position that the employer had to do this. I am sick and tired of hearing negative response by everyone that business is leaving on account of the conditions in the State of Illinois. They do it for many other reasons. And I am a firm believer that we can't blame the economic structure on a Democrat Party or any other Party in the State of Illinois because of the situation recession that we are in. I think if we recall back in 1973 when the fake energy situation was...shortage was perpetrated on all of us, I think we can go back and if we look from that point forward, they are the culprits that lead us...led us into our recession. I'm a firm believer that we have a good program and I think we ought to keep it. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In the past five years we've heard about the assets and the liabilities of this workman's compensation."

And unfortunately, it's not just the fault of the Democrats. It's not just the fault of the Republicans. It's the fault of a lot of people that we find ourselves in this mess today. It's because of politics, where we are right now. It's not the fault of labor up here. It's not the fault of the Chamber of Commerce. It's the fault of everybody together collectively. For five years we've been talking about agreed Bills and for the last two years we've talked about an agreed Bill as far as workman's comp. is concerned. It didn't happen. And here we are in the eleventh hour and still nothing has happened. So let's not talk politics, Republicans versus Democrats, management versus labor. The fault lies in the Leadership up there, up there and the leadership on both sides of this aisle. That's where the fault is. We have nothing we can vote for and as a result, politically, we're all losers. And realistically, on the outside, business and labor likewise are losers. This has become a political issue unfortunately, but after all, the election is only four months away. But how unfortunate that this is the way the system is run. I've got to vote today, I'm going to, and I think the assets outweigh the liabilities of this Bill and I'm going to vote 'yes'...but this system is so imperfect."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't like the shape this Bill is in. The Members of the Senate, namely Representative...I mean, Senator Jim Donnewald, Senator Rock, DeAngelis and some of the others over

there worked about seven months to work out the shape of 1739 when it came over here. We got a lot of publicity that we were finally going to do something about workman's comp. And, as everyone knows, it's been gutted pretty well, although there are some changes that I consider, something a little better than superficial which is all we've done before. I would like to say that I'm going to vote 'yes' on the Bill, only that it gets in Conference Committee and only that we get another chance to get it back into the shape it was. And I'll guarantee you I won't vote for it if it comes back in Conference Committee like it is now. So I'm going to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was waiting until it got 89 votes because I wanted everyone to know that I was voting because I wanted to vote for it, not because I have to. Anytime somebody votes for one of these...piece of legislation on behalf of the people, people always try to find out why you vote for it. I'm voting because I have something in common with these injured workers' disability. And when injured workers are injured more than their ability to work is taken away from them. And to have these people suffer because industry has always included this cost in their program and in their charges. But because of the energy problem they can't afford it, they say. Why should the poor working man who gets hurt pay because of high energy costs. And that is why I'm voting for the person who is handicapped like I am to have an opportunity to be

commensurated for his damages. That's why I'm voting...I'm voting 'aye'."

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

Matula: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I whole-heartedly agree with Representative Tuerk when he made the remark that this Bill is not a reform Bill, it's a deform bill. Since I've been on this floor I have been very much...very concerned about business. We need business. The way things have been going we have been losing hundreds and hundreds of businesses that have left this state. We've lost thousands upon thousands of jobs. About a month and a half ago I had an opportunity to talk to a gentleman that owns a manufacturing concern in my district. And in the process of our discussion he was making a remark. There are two things on his mind, expansion of his plant or not. He stated if the workman's comp. does not get better in the State of Illinois they will be also leaving. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we are hurting our constituents today if we vote for this Bill. It's not going to help us. It's going to hinder business and we will all be sorry for what we do here today. And I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the Illinois Manufacturers Association and the Chamber of Commerce certainly has been doing a disservice to the State of Illinois because I've never seen a negative sales job in my life than that they are doing about

the great state of Illinois and its many assets. And I think it's about time that they start selling the positive assets of Illinois and a great state it is, the great area that it is to work in, produce products and to make a profitable business. And I think that they should start going on that basis and sell the better parts of Illinois rather than their negative sales that they've been doing over the years. And I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Abraham Lincoln said it many years ago, 'You cannot help the wage earner by tearing down the wage payer.' And I think that says it all. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In eight years that I've been with this Body, I frankly have not seen one Party so determined to relinquish control to the other. I'm a little bit reminded of the story when Henry the VIII went to marry the Queen of Scotland, Mary, Queen of Scot. He looked in the mirror, he looked next to the dresser and on that dresser he had a picture of the fine young lady. She was certainly not the best looking woman that you've ever met, in fact, she was quite ugly and had a couple of marks on her face. He turned to a good friend and said, 'Oh, the name of the things that I do and in the name of my country.' Well, I guess today I feel very much like that. We had some good chances. We had a chance to make a good Bill better. But I guess I've been through the

kamikaze training and if the rest of my Party really don't want to be the one of the Majority, I'll join you. So vote me 'aye'."

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

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The remarks were made on the other side of the aisle about how much more people...how many more we have employed in the State of Illinois. Listen, Zeke, you talked about how many more people we have working in the State of Illinois. Zeke, when we get out of Session I would invite you to come to Galesburg where we have better than twelve percent unemployment."

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

Murphy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Explaining my 'aye' vote, now I've only been down here two terms and I see some tax breaks being given to certain people in this state. It's all for certain groups that gets taken care of. You forget the people. Now we're talking about workman's comp. Workman's comp. is the person that is injured on the job. You've got...you people, especially on the other side of the aisle, you're taking...you're talking about wrecked automobiles. If you can fix these automobiles, but...a person that is making a...a dollar for his people to eat off of, he is stymied to hear what some of you people are saying. You've done a good job with the press. But you don't go into the shops and talk to those people there about their problems. You can only legislate them so long and they will all be up on the uprising. So don't

think that just because the election is around the corner that you're going to fool them. They're up to what's going on on the other side of the aisle."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Simas."

Simas: "Mr. Speaker, if it should reach 89 votes I'd like a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 88 'aye', 75 'no'. Representative McPike."

McPike: "Poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Abramson. Laurino. Molloy. Preston. Schlickman and Stearney."

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

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded on this measure?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Lady recorded?"

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

Chapman: "Keep me that way, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Balanoff, are you seeking recognition? On this question... Representative Preston... Representative Preston."

Preston: "Mr. Speaker, would you record me as voting 'aye'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative Preston as 'aye'. Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. While there's a lull here I would like to make a small announcement about the social..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute, the Lady is in order."

Representative Balanoff. Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I merely want to point to the Republican side of the aisle and specifically Representative Griesheimer, that here's one Member on this side of the aisle who pays this thing as a small businessman and I'm voting 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there's 89 'ayes' and 75 'no'. Representative Simms."

Simms: "While we have a little verification time..."

Speaker Redmond: "Give him a little verification."

~~Simms: "We'll have a...we'll verify...like a verification and...to see if all those folks are over there."~~

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms has requested a verification...please be quiet, Representative Collins. Representative Simms has requested a verification of the affirmative Roll Call. That's within his rights. I...Mr. Clerk, verify the affirmative Roll Call."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you speaking on Representative Simms' request for a verification? Are you speaking on Representative Simms' request for a verification? What's your point?"

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, last night on an Amendment, Representative Madigan asked for one Member and you removed him. I ask that you remove Representative Hanahan before we begin."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."

Collins: "That was established by you last night."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms has requested a

verification of the affirmative Roll Call. Mr. Clerk...Mr. Clerk, proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Alexander."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Breslin, for what purpose do you rise?"

Breslin: "To be...leave to be verified, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "May Representative...objection has been raised. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Balanoff. Beatty. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Chilton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kucharski. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Schraeder. Sharp. Slape. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Van Dwyne. Vitek. VonBoeckman. White. Willer. Williamson. Sam Wolf. Young. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions of the affirmative Roll Call?"

Simms: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, just one moment. Representative Darrow."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Simms: "Donovan."

Speaker Redmond: "Donovan is in the middle aisle."

Simms: "Garnisa."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Remove Representative Garnisa."

Simms: "Hanahan. Representative Hanahan, the Gentlemen from McHenry."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Hanahan here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove Representative Hanahan."

Simms: "Representative Schneider."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Simms: "Slape."

Speaker Redmond: "Slape here? He's back there."

Simms: "That's all, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representat... Representative Karpel. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I wonder if while I'm talking very slowly and Mike Madigan is walking toward me, temporarily, I want to change my vote to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "What did you say, Representative Madigan...Matijevich?"

Matijevich: "Temporarily, I'm voting 'no' for procedural reasons."

Speaker Redmond: "Change Representative Matijevich from 'yes' to 'no'. Representative Ewell."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I don't think that that's a very good vote and I think that I should be recorded as 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'present'. Representative Kelly. Representative Garmisa has returned, put him back on the Roll Call. Representative Darrow has returned, put him back on the Roll Call. Representative James Taylor, for what purpose do you arise?"

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I was wondering what was going on around here. I see they're changing votes from one position to the other. That's why I was trying to find out, what do you think is happening right now?"

Speaker Redmond: "One hundred and eighty-three days until Christmas."

Taylor: "A hundred and eighty-three days until Christmas...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, would like to change my vote to 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman, from 'aye' to 'present'. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, change me to 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle to 'present'. Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Please change my vote from 'aye' to 'present',
Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Marovitz from 'aye' to 'present'.
Representative Kelly. Representative Kelly, 'no'.
Representative Mautino. Wait a minute now."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to have my 'aye'
vote changed to 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Mautino, 'present'. Representative
Pechous."

Pechous: "Have strategy...please change me to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pechous to 'no'.
Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would you advise the Members of
the House how far away Representative Hanahan is so
we...only votes are going to be changed that's
dilatatory, Mr. Speaker? It's terrible."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I
was going to suggest this dilatatory action...if you
read the Journal at least we might learn something by
going through the Journal instead of these dilatatory
tactics."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Record me 'present', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Leverenz as 'present'.
Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I've been convinced by Representative
Daniels. Would you record me as 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'no'.
Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, would you have someone on the other

side of the aisle go through that thing again about Party control on this side of the aisle and not over there? I'd like to hear that again."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Breslin."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Lady recorded?"

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

Breslin: "Well you know, Mr. Speaker, one of the problems with this legislation and a lot of the legislation that we're going to be considering from today on until July 1, is the fact that we are considering totally new legislation that our constituents have not had any input into. It's a problem that we have to face constantly. It's one of the reasons that I have regularly suggested that this General Assembly eliminate Amendments on Second Reading. And I would suggest that people consider that as a possibility when we consider rules in the Eighty-Second General Assembly. Regardless of that fact, waiting for my constituents to contact me on how I should vote on this legislation, I would request..."

Speaker Redmond: "How do you vote?"

Breslin: "...to change my vote from 'aye' to 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Lady from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise on a point of personal privilege and make an observation in doing so."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, you are perverting the office of Speaker in such a disgraceful manner it's beyond

description. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House have voted, we had a verification. Apparently your side of the aisle has lost and yet you're afraid to announce the Roll Call. Now, Mr. Speaker, you have a responsibility to all the Members of this House to treat us reasonably fair. What you're going through now is an absolute disgrace and it falls upon the shoulders of every Member of this House and you're the one who is doing it. What are you afraid of? Announce the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "I want to give every Member the chance to be recorded the way..."

Telcser: "You want to stall for time and try and find more votes. Well you don't have them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker, point of order. It appears things have broken down here for whatever reason and I would direct your attention to Rule 45 D. That rule allows any ten Members to ask for a verified oral Roll Call prior to the commencement of a vote. However, it allows you the discretion to call for one at any time, as I read it. And I would ask that you consider that at this point since there has been so many changes and we would get an accurate representation of the vote here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Alexander. Representative Williams. Representative Williams. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Just to hear his response to personal privilege, I think Ray Ewell is a scoundrel. I think Ray Ewell is a scoundrel, one of the worst scoundrels

I've ever seen in my life. Ray Ewell, that's the guy.

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. My name was used in debate in a very foul and unethical manner. And I've had my name for a long time, many, many years. In fact, my good name has been given to me, not just thrown at me but it was given to me, deliberately, overtly and I don't know whether there was malice before thought, but I received it. And since that time I have scuffled with that name, I have lived intimately with it. It has been with me night and day. And I'm---hurt, deeply hurt...deeper than perhaps most of you know or could ever sense or feel because if you had a name like mine you too would want it protected for it is the only thing that I have of importance or consequence to me. Now I've had many things in life but nothing like my good name. My name has never been attacked before. My name has gone through generations of unscathed honor and esteem in the hearts of men, in the heart of Kelly, there, who has known--and loved me for many years. Bus Yourell has known me for many years and he has had a similar name and there have been a great number of confusion as between us. But so that his name won't be hurt, I have to tell you the difference between us. Mr. Yourell is a noble Gentleman but his hair and mine are different. And that is the primarily difference. But as his love for me has grown..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close, please."

Ewell: "...over the years....well, I just want to say this because there are many people who are hurt by this

attack on my good name. I mean, there's Dawson there..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close, please."

Ewell: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's the way it is, that's the way it is. And I shall bring my remarks to a close and hope that never again would anyone use my name in that type of savage, vicious and unrelenting attack that is absolutely unprovoked, uncalled for, without reason and..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point...of announcement for the Republican side of the aisle. Our supply of milk and orange juice has been replenished so you can have a drink while we're waiting four hours to find which one of Hanahan's addresses he's at."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan has returned. Put him back on the Roll Call. We better...Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the demonstration of what you can all do when you really care about an issue. It's too bad you couldn't have done it a week ago. Please change my vote from 'yes' to 'no!'"

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Lady from 'yes' to 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I believe I had my 'aye' vote changed to a 'present'. At this time I would like to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Mautino 'aye'. Has everybody been recorded the way they want to be recorded? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I wish that you would return my vote to 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Woods -- Bowman 'yes'. Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Would you change my vote from 'present' back to 'yes'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Marovitz 'yes'. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Change my vote back to 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "'Yes'. Representative Leverenz. Leverenz 'yes'?"

Leverenz: "Record me 'aye'. Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, as a private businessman, and I don't have any work comp. coverage and Jim Taylor sits here and he persuaded me that if I follow Lee Daniels I'd have to move to DuPage, so I'm going to change back to green."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Preston, green. Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "'No'."

Speaker Redmond: "Ewell 'no'. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I want to apologize to Ray Ewell and also change my vote back to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Matijevich 'aye'. Anyone else desire to change their vote? Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "I voted the way I wanted to vote a week ago. Today I'll change my vote from 'present' to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Breslin 'no'. Anything further? Anyone else want to change their vote? Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "With all the confusion I just want to make sure how I'm recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Dunn recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone else changing their vote? What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 84 'aye', 80 'no'. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Take the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "84 'aye'...how many 'no'? 80 'no'. And this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Representative Simms."

Simms: "Having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider that vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "And I move to leave it lay on the Table."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms has...Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, in opposition to the Gentleman's motion"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Madigan: "It's a bad motion, and it ought to be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: Representative Simms is...having voted on the prevailing side has moved that the vote by which it lost be reconsidered. Representative Huskey has moved that that lie on the Table. Question...the question is on the motion to table, those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 82 'aye' and 85 'no' and the motion fails. Senate bills, Second Reading, 569. Senate bill 569. Repre...too late now, Representative Simms. You didn't put the motion to

table, that was Representative Huskey's motion to table. Motion to table lost, I guess you're right there. Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, I'll withdraw my motion..."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman withdraws..."

Simms: "...so that we can proceed with the orderly business of the House because I know you're interested in expediting it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, that's untimely. You've called another Bill, we're on another Bill right now and let's keep on with the business of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I believe his request was untimely...his withdrawal. We're on another Bill right now, Senate Bill 569."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills, Second Reading, Senate Bill 569, page three."

Leone: "Senate Bill 569. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. This Bill has been read a second time previously."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it has become my dubious distinction two nights in a row, to follow the workman's compensation issue, with Senate Bill 569. This morning we considered Amendment number three and we adopted it after a great deal of discussion. After further discussion I think, that we removed at least a significant amount of the opposition to this program. And so Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the adoption

of Amendment number four to Senate Bill 569. Which provides the working cash fund program for the Chicago School Finance Authority. This morning we adopted an amendment to add an additional \$73,000,000 to their bonding authority. This Bill provides that 45,000,000 of that bonding authority will be used by that authority for working cash fund in relation to their relationship with the Chicago Board of Education. I move the adoption of Amendment number four."

Speaker Leinenweber: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Representative Hoffman, didn't...when we created this authority, didn't we at the same time abolish the working cash fund for the Chicago Board of Education."

Hoffman: "The working cash fund for the Chicago Board of Education was abolished and the working cash fund anticipation notes were rolled into the...was part of the whole expenditure program and were put under the general obligation category. The state...the Chicago Board of Education will not have and this does not create for them a working cash fund."

Leinenweber: "Well, this is basically the same thing though, it creates it for the authorities to issue...so they can loan the Chicago Board of Education the same as if the Chicago Board of Education has its own cash fund. Wouldn't it?"

Hoffman: "The fact...the fact is that this will be under the authority of the Chicago School Finance Authorities. It limits it so they can only provide that working cash fund for the Chicago Board of Education, which will have to be repaid within eleven months. As well

as the fact, that once that....is no longer needed the bonds will be retired with the money that's been charged."

Leinenweber: "Well, that's the point that I'd like to....ask you another question about it...As I under...if I read it correctly, it seems to me that the authority has sole discretion to determine when the working cash fund can be abolished. Isn't that correct?"

Hoffman: "That's correct."

Leinenweber: "And upon abolition and then the money goes for debt service, is that correct?"

Hoffman: "That's correct."

Leinenweber: "And there's nothing in this amendment which would prohibit the authority from recreating a working cash fund, immediately thereafter. Isn't that correct?"

Hoffman: "The forty million...the forty-five million dollars of which will net out of forty...is the only amount of money that can be utilized for that out of their..total indebtedness."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in opposition to amendment number four. This is a...appears to be a 'shell game', to again create more money in addition to what was thought to have been necessary last winter when various power groups of the state got together to fashion the....the authority to issue the half-billion dollars worth of bonds. This money is to be used for...bond money for a working cash fund and without the apparent limitation this can be abolished and the money turned over to pay interest on debts. I think it's a bad idea. It was felt back

last winter when we created this thing, that a working cash fund was not necessary. It was collapsed. In the Bill the money was presumably used with the...pay current expenses. Now they want to recreate it, I think that's a bad idea. I would urge opposition to the amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's...who you pointing at Representative? Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I know we're kind of in a...could we have some order Mr. Speaker? Speaker Redmond, could we have some order?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "We're having trouble hearing, I think."

Speaker Redmond: "Please, give the Gentleman order."

Schneider: "Don't let anybody confuse you with the facts, Representative Ryan. I think one of the contest that we have to be aware of, is that when you're dealing with the working cash fund at this point. Is that it does make it...easier to sell these bonds. When you begin to identify how those monies are going to be used, I think there's a greater sense of assurance from those...those who are going to be buying the bonds, that they can be more accurately pinpointed. So, I think the working cash fund is essential to providing necessary relief for the city. Keep in mind of course, that...is no state impact for those of you who have that fear. That there has been a good faith effort by the city of the school district, rather, to relieve some of the problems that have been facing them for a number of years. As the co-chairman of the

committee which is investigating the...all the schools...I think again you ought to be assured that many of us who serve on that committee have been concentrating on their ability to not only to meet the obligations to reduce some of the items that we identify as waste and still provide the good program. But we've got to be able to help them in regard to establishing working cash fund. Last night the argument rolled in this direction, that is the cost of the bonds over last few months. In order to get to the point where they wanted to get which was beyond five hundred million, at this time, I guess. It was essential that we be able to add these seventy-three million dollars in the working cash fund enhances the...the opportunity to sell these bonds. So, the Sponsor of the amendment is right. We need the proposal, and I would again encourage an 'aye' vote in order to help out the city, and the school district."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jack Davis."

Davis: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will, have we read this amendment, Mr. Clerk?"

Leone: "Amendment #4, Hoffman, amends Senate Bill 569, as amended."

Davis: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I hope you're paying close attention. I want to ask the Sponsor a question, I wanted to ask him on Amendment #3. Representative Hoffman, when the school board authority mandated a hundred million dollars in cuts to the Chicago Board of Education in their budget to offset the abuses of spending in that budget over the past ten years,

during the interim financing period. What is the current level of cuts mandated by the school authorities, total..."

Speaker Redmond: "John."

Leinenweber: "...with the cuts already made, and the cuts to be made by September first. Representative Hoffman...Hoffman...Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much. On this particular amendment of course, does not address that question at all. This is a working cash fund amendment."

Leinenweber: "Representative Hoffman, I understand your evasion of the question, simply because working cash fund is part of \$73,000,000 in additional bonding to aid the short term cash crunch. I believe the papers are correct, that figure of \$100,000,000 in mandated cuts has been reduced to \$82,000,000, for whatever reason. Maybe because this Bill was going to fund portions of the...of the balance so they could continue in their deficit position. Representative Hoffman, what's the current average of property taxes in the city of Chicago to go to the school system?"

Hoffman: "I don't know."

Leinenweber: "In percent."

Hoffman: "I do not know."

Leinenweber: "I can tell you, it's 37%. Do you know what it is in DuPage County, what percent of your...property taxes go to your school districts?"

Hoffman: "In the neighborhood of 55 to 60%."

Leinenweber: "I thought you said 55 to 60, is that correct? Will County is somewhere close to 70% of suburban and downstate taxes go that way. If the city of Chicago

raised their property taxes through city council action which we debate on that point, or through coming through the legislature to increase without tax referendum. Would the doors of the financial community swing a little wider in short term money, obviating the need for a working cash fund."

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

Leinenweber: "Well, it calls for a conclusion on your part. I'll withdraw that question. Is a...a tax increase...at the Chicago Board of Education level...is a tax increase of the city of Chicago on property taxes the ultimate long term and short term solution for their deficit position?"

Hoffman: "I would...I would not presume to know the answer to that question or to...to answer for them. Obviously, this money related to these bonds are...going to rest on their ability to pay them back or they're not going to be able to sell them. The School Finance Authority has the right to levy a tax necessary to meet the cost of retiring these bonds on the schedule that's provided and that's coming out of the property tax."

Leinenweber: "Then indeed, what you've said with this amendment and Amendment #3, I hope you're all listening on the Republican side of the aisle. Is this a tax increase without referendum for the citizens of the city of Chicago?"

Hoffman: "Is this amendment a tax increase...this amendment provides for a working cash fund."

Leinenweber: "...Is Amendment 3...Is the combined effect of Amendment 3 and 4 a tax increase without referendum

for the city of Chicago?"

Hoffman: "It...it merely provides a method for them to raise an additional \$73,000,000 to long term...long term borrowing."

Leinenweber: "Well, I gather from...also that evasive answer, Representative Hoffman, that the answer of course, is yes."

Hoffman: "Ladies and Gentlemen..."

Leinenweber: "Ladies and Gentlemen here we are right back at the well again. The School Authority which I heartily supported in between the Chicago Board of Education and the public to help them get their house in order. Has cut their requirement...has cut their requirement for mandated cuts in their deficit position by \$18,000,000. The city of Chicago does not have the courage to vote the tax increase on their property tax owners without referendum. They know damn well they can't pass one with a referendum. They don't have the courage to come to this Legislature to ask us to do it in front to increase property taxes for schools without a referendum. There's always an election around the corner, there was a primary election they couldn't do it now, there's a general election, they can't do it. But this is a tax increase without referendum. Their house is not in order. We're right back at the same well again. And I don't think this is a very good idea and I don't believe you should think this is a very good idea."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to clarify some of the comments made by the previous speaker. I don't

know why he refers to coming back to the well. What we're talking about here is providing bonding authority. The payoff of which will be done against Chicago area property. This does not involve one penny of...of state funds. In terms of the cuts that had to made, the cuts...the hardest cuts that were made so far and the only cuts...the only deadline that we've had is the sixty million. That sixty million dollar cut has been made. And it was made on time. We have because the initial \$500,000,000 was first allowed...first granted the authority to float that. There was a substantial change in interest rates and cost of bond floating and so on. The amounts of the estimates of actual cash in hand were wrong. We also as the author of this Amendment pointed out are very much in need of a cash flow fund. We have to have that. The city of Chicago Board of Education Financing Authority needs that money because anyone who is familiar with educational financing knows that there are periods....although you may have the books due and owing. Money may be due and owing and you might be in a healthy financial situation, the cash flow problems occur. The cash flow problem is actually having a cash...a working cash fund...is actually good business. The Finance Authority has come, asked for help in this, asked for authority to do it. They have not asked for the money to do it. The city of Chicago, the people of the city of Chicago will pay for it. I don't see that it's that much of a major request. I ask that you vote favorable....for a favorable vote on this."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 25, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Redmond: "Represent...Representative McBroom."

McBroom: "Mr. Speak...Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman's moved the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put? Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no', and the 'ayes' have it. The motion carried. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As I opened the discussion on this amendment I indicated to you that the major opposition the...Minority...Leader..is now in support of this amendment but obviously I've not removed all the objections and I appreciate where those particular folks are coming from. I think we've explained the Bill well enough. Those of you who know me, know I would not be sponsoring this kind of legislation, if I didn't think it was needed. There obviously is nothing personal in it to me. These people came to the schools problem commission. We had the hearing, we invited everybody. They came with a program much broader than this. We nailed it down, to this and we're presenting it for your consideration today, and I would ask your 'aye' vote on Amendment #4 which limits the expenditure of \$45,000,000 of the \$73,000,000 we adopted in the third amendment for your...for use in a working cash fund, which means it can not be used for short term expenses at all and so I would move for the adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "Questions on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor say

'aye', 'aye', Roll Call has been requested. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Walsh, one minute to explain his vote."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're right back at it again from what we did this morning. That is trying to reinstate for the Chicago Board of Education a working cash fund. That which they felt they did not need as recently as one year ago, and so was abolished so that they could use for operations. This time they disguise it by giving it to the Finance Authority. But the Finance Authority is the Chicago Board of Education, Mr. Speaker. It is bad, it's a deception and I urge your 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "All voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 73 'ayes', 53 'no', and the motion carries. Amendments adopted. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Henry, Huff, Bullock. Amends Senate Bill 569 as amended in the title and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Henry, is that the Sponsor?"

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker....amendment...quite briefly, Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 569 is very simple and you all is familiar with it. This amendment will create Chicago community school study commission. Which will report back to this House on December 1980, is finding...."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Henry: "We will report back to this House by December 1980."

Its finding recommendations and proposed legislation...will be reported and I know of no opposition or agreement with the Sponsor of this Bill. It passed the House before and I request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've discussed this Amendment with the...with the..Mr. Henry and we've looked it over and made a couple of three changes and...I endorse the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 5. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried. The Amendment's adopted. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Henry, Huff, Bullock. Amends Senate Bill 569 in the title by inserting before the period the following 'and so forth'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Henry."

Henry: "Mr. Speaker, request leave to withdraw that Amendment #6."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment 6 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Earlier today, I filed with the Clerk and also orally made a demand pursuant to Supreme Court rule 34D, that this Bill be returned to the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day and be read by the amended title on two days before final passage."

Speaker Redmond: "Where's the Parliamentarian? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I think we'll wait for the Parliamentarian but I think that's out of order. We'll have the Parliamentarian rule on it, because of...I don't believe the Amendments have changed the title, if they changed the title then that would be in order but the Parliamentarian's there and I think he could rule on that now."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute, are there more Amendments? I was told there were no further Amendments. Representative Henry. I've been advised by the Parliamentarian that the point is well taken due to Amendment #5. What does he have to do? Either you move to table the Amendment or the Sponsor move to suspend the rule. Representative Henry."

Henry: "Mr. Speaker, could I get a clarification of explanation on that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute, now. Be quiet. What was your request?"

Henry: "Clarification and explanation."

Speaker Redmond: "No he wants a clarification. Amendment #5 rewrote the title. Therefore his request and his motion is in order. Now his request can be circumvented either by you tabling Amendment #5 or by Representative Hoffman the Sponsor of the Bill, moving to suspend the rule. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr...Mr. Sponsor, I would...or Mr. Speaker as Sponsor of the...of the Bill I would move to suspend...suspend the appropriate rule."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman moves to suspend

the provisions of Rules 34D. Representative Leinenweber on the motion."

Leinenweber: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would certainly urge that we vote no on the...on the Gentleman's motion. The...the rule was put into our rules...House rules for a very good reason and that is when we...as Representative Katz who eloquently pointed out this morning when we completely changed Bills by deleting everything after the enacting clause in the wanning hours of the Session by supplying entirely new legislation which in as much as this is a Senate Bill will not be heard by either House on three consecutive days, will not be heard any committee. We don't even know basically what's in this. All we know is that it's giving a authority which we created some additional, vast additional powers to issue bonds. That apparently weren't even thought of this past winter when we created this thing. I think that in interest of good legislative practice we ought to avoid the temptation of circumventing the Constitution and not be stampeded into passing these vast, expensive proposals. I urge a 'no' vote on the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. Question is Representative Hoffman's motion to suspend the provisions of the rule. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, what's the motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "Suspend 34D. To permit the Bill to go to Third Reading."

Lechowicz: "Oh, okay, fine."

Speaker Redmond: "You heard the motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed to 'no'. Suspension of the rule. Takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 99 'aye' and 30 'no', and the motion prevails. The rule is suspended, Third Reading. 1908. Representative Braun, ready for that one. 1908. I have to do this one."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1908, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Representa...out of the record. 1524. Second Bill,...Senate Bill, Second Reading. Oh, it's on Third Reading, yeah. We go with that one today, 1524. Mr. Clerk, where are we here, Representative Daniels....Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this was on Second Reading today."

Speaker Redmond: "Supplemental it's on the...supplemental calendar number one."

Ebbesen: "Well, for the record, Mr. Speaker there is a Supplemental that's on that."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, there is, Supplemental one."

Ebbesen: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bill 1524. And under the Order of Motions, on the Supplemental Calendar #1, Representative Daniels filed a motion to suspend the provisions of 35-C with respect to the provisions of...with respect to Senate

Bill 1524. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, as I understand I need to suspend the Rule 35-C. We were tied up last night as we all know on the Worker's Compensation issue which pushed us over until midnight last night. And beyond that, I need the vote of the House in order to hear this on Third Reading today. This is the Bill involving the Habitual Offender's Act which is the three-time loser Bill. A very essential piece of legislation to answer the problems that we're having throughout Illinois...and some of the convicted felons, the three-time felons, and we're trying to address that right now. I ask for your assistance in having this heard immediately."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, this is the Christmas Tree Bill that has brought together all sorts of things, the abortion provisions, eliminating...Mr. Kelly took exception to, provisions with regard to...to passing a law relating to three-time losers in twelve hours, instant legislation, other Bills regarding...responding to the Supreme Court's decision in twelve hours regarding the question of residential picketing. It is a Bill that has no business being considered at any time and to consider it at the eleventh hour on the last day is absolutely an atrocious abuse of legislative procedures. None of these Bills have been to Committee..been heard. They've simply been jumped in and put together on this one Bill and I would hope that the Members would resist this effort and want to...the Speaker to be aware that there will be a

verification if this does get 107 votes because this is really a very unfair way of passing legislation, at this eleventh hour."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Last night, as you know, we did adopt an earlier Amendment, #4, which was the pro-life Amendment which was replaced by Amendment #5, which struck everything after the enacting clause. Since that time, I have discussed that issue with some of the leaders in the pro-life movement to determine what, if any, their position would be. I would like to be honest and frank. The position that was given to me was that since this concept has changed that they were not going to take any position. And, therefore, whatever the Legislators, particularly those who are pro-life in persuasion, could do, they could do on their own. I, myself, I don't intend to support this proposal. I would say that I realize that Representative Roman Kosinski has been a strong, vigorous leader of this issue for many, many years and I have supported him in his proposals before. I resent a last minute maneuver of changing around, this is my own personal opinion, a concept that I consider very important into moving into a complete different subject for various reasons. And I am, on my own, going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone else? Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Very quickly, we have debated this many times. Just so everyone knows what the vote is all about, if you're against any one of the Bills which

are included in this package, I would ask that you vote 'no'. It's...this motion requires 107 votes. As Representative Katz indicated, we're going to ask for a verification. If you are in opposition to any one of the Bills, the picketing Bill, which is included in this, and the three-time loser Bill which has been defeated so many times, I would again ask that you vote 'no' on this motion."

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

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let's make sure we all understand what we're voting on. We're voting on a three-time loser Bill. Let's not get caught up in dialog on pro-life or anything else, when the Gentleman that spoke previously issued his Amendment yesterday for the first time. We never got a chance to look at it before then. And then, let's not get confused with some other dialog about possibly bleeding hearts about three-time convicted felons. This vote is very essential to addressing a serious problem. It was brought to the attention of the Governor by the SUN-TIMES editorial and of course, by Representative Kosinski's continual effort. Just give us an opportunity to address this very important issue right now. We need your help to have it heard immediately and I solicit your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the suspension of the provisions of Rule 35-C with respect to Senate Bill 1524. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish?"

Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote. There are certain parts of our society that think...the only answer to the problems in our society is to make the penalty more severe, put everyone in jail. I don't think that this is the answer. I think we've given due consideration to the issue that would be discussed in Senate Bill 1524. I think...it's had its opportunity. We should let it die."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Conti, are you seeking recognition? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 107 'aye' and 37 'no'. Representative Cullerton has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Vitek."

Vitek: "Mr. Speaker, may I be verified on this Roll Call?"

Speaker Redmond: "May the Gentleman be verified? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Poll the absentees please, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Piel. Poll the absentees."

Piel: "May I be verified, please Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "May Representative Piel be verified? Representative Wolf. You want to be verified? Anybody verify Wolf? Objection has been raised. Piel and J.J. Wolf. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Bluthardt. Casey. Deuster. Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Griesheimer. Johnson. Karpel. Klosak. Krska. Laurino..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf...?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Breslin..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Wolf, 'aye'. Proceed."

Proceed. Wolf, 'aye'. Sam Wolf. Representative Van Dayne."

Van Dayne: "Yes, I'd like to be voted 'aye' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Van Dayne, 'aye'. Proceed with the poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Leverenz. Madigan. McBroom. McCourt. McGrew. McMaster. Meyer..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Karpziel, for what purpose do you arise? 'aye'? Desires to be recorded as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mulcahey. Polk. Rigney..."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Robbins..."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Schlickman. Telcser. Totten. Tuerk. VonBoeckman. Walsh..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Pushed the wrong button, Mr. Speaker. I want to be recorded as voting 'aye' on this issue."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative Bradley as 'aye'. McAuliffe, 'aye'. Representative Doyle, 'aye'. Representative Schraeder, 'aye'. Jessie White. Jessie White desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Christensen, 'aye'. Representative Stanley asks leave to be verified. Representative Cullerton. Representative Cullerton. Representative..."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "...on Representative Breslin's phone."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I would defer to my Leader, Representative Lechowicz, and withdraw my request for

a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has withdrawn his request for a verification. 118 'aye' and 37 'no'. The motion prevails. Read the Bill a Third time. Mr. Daniels."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1524. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am grateful for your expression last night and I'm grateful for your expression now. Now, we're running with the Bill, the Bill that the people want, the people...the Bill that the newspapers have supported, the Bill that's very much needed to stop that revolving door on habitual criminals. I ask for your continued vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, just briefly so that the record is perfectly clear, despite a provision in the Illinois Constitution that Bills will have three readings, this particular Bill has had only one day of reading and it's certainly not that three...and will not have three in the other House. Despite a Constitutional provision that requires that public notice be given and that the people have opportunity to see it before the Committee, none of the Bills embraced here have had any Committee hearing. I hope that that issue

will be raised by someone in the course of the litigation that arises after this. And I am pleased to vote 'no' to this legislation monstrosity."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I wanted to explain my vote. I've got an idea that I think people might want to consider and we can press it and vote on it next year. I think it would be very helpful in our re-election campaign. What I suggest is that we make all criminal offenses Class X. Make them all Class X, okay? Then we won't have to worry about these Bills, you know, that increase penalties. So all...be Class X. Now why should the Governor be the only guy that gets to pardon people? We have legislative scholarships. We can give out scholarships. Why can't State Representatives give out pardons? I think we should have all penalties, every criminal offense be a Class X and each Representative gets three pardons per district. Can you imagine how many people you can get to work for you on election day? I think it's a very good idea. I'd like to consider it and I'll put the Bill in next year."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill was amended and brought back and forth many times. I wonder if the Sponsor might, in explaining his vote, tell us what the Amendments are on the Bill and...period. I know we've struck the enacting clause and...put a whole new Bill. I'd like to know just exactly what position that it is. I know that three-time loser, all right, and then...then the picketing and that is all that's on

the Bill. The abortion...Mr. Kelly's Amendment is off of the Bill? Only two issues on the Bill? All right. Then I'm...thank you. No, Kelly's is not on there. Thank you very much. Just those is two issues the picketing and a three-time loser than 'aye' is the right vote...correct vote. Thank you."

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

Lecnowicz: "Well, for the record, Mr. Speaker, the three-time loser Bill has been considered by this House in the past four years. I'm sure there's been ample testimony and hearings. I'm sure there's been ample input from the public. And I'm sure if you take a look at the results, as far as the public input, the people have been waiting a long, long time for that Bill. And I strongly encourage an 'aye' vote, and the remainder of 'aye' votes I'm sure will be upheld by the courts as well."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 'aye' and 31 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1828. On Supplemental Calendar one."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1828. A Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Revenue Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1828 has two parts, the first deals with the upgrading of the certified assessed Illinois Assessing Officers Certificate and there is one amendment on the Bill and

one substantive amendment beyond that it deals with permissive use of counties in providing tax incentives. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Unknown: "Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keane."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Question is shall this Bill pass? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Would you mind a little constitutional questioning of...someone or other."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Skinner: "Why is the Amendment offered by Representative Vinson considered constitutional?"

Keane: "I yield to Representative Vinson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Well, I think for two reasons, Representative.

First, the constitutional provision which you're looking at is in Section 4A, I believe, of the Revenue Article of the Constitution and I think first of all you have to read that section in the context of Section 13 of the Legislative Article which deals with Special Legislation. And it indicates in that Article that the test on Special Legislation is judicially reviewable. Which is clearly excluded on Section 4A in the Revenue Article. In addition to that, as a matter of fact it says that the evaluation shall be ascertained by the General Assembly as provided in law. In addition to that, I would make the point that the relief authorized is uniformly authorized throughout the state. And secondly, that it is

applied uniformly against all classes of property. There's no discrimination in the relief against...farming property, against residential property, against commercial property all classes are eligible for the relief."

Skinner: "The Article speaks primarily in the Revenue Act to uniformity. And it would seem to me that if one gave a tax credit to a new home...a new home purchaser and...would...did not give a tax credit to a used home purchaser, that one would not be treating that class of property of...that is, single family residences uniformly. Could you respond to that objection? Or at least reservation."

Vinson: "Yes, I think....that a two-fold response is appropriate. First, if you go to the purpose of the Constitutional provision, which I think is relevant in this case. The purpose was to limit classification, to those cases authorized by statute in...or by the Constitution in Section 4B of the Revenue Article. It was to make it clear that those...that was the only kind of permissible classification under the Constitution. Now, this does not constitute...this provision that we are talking about on 1828 does not constitute classification. Because it's directed at all classes of property. And classification as we have known it and as the framers of the Constitution knew it. Applied to things like the difference between industrial, commercial and residential and farming property. That's the first part of my response. The second part of my response is that all property is eligible for this relief. Any time you make an

improvement to any kind of property, it's eligible for this relief. And therefore it's uniform."

Skinner: "Well, given the Supreme Court's interpretation of assessment legislation since 1970 Constitution your answer may be enough justification for them to rule it Constitutional. Let's talk about the merits of the Bill. What is the purpose of the Amendment?"

Vinson: "Well, the purpose of the Amendment is to stimulate...alright..investment, the purpose of the Amendment is to improve the economy. The purpose of the Amendment is to provide an incentive to savings to investment so that we'll have more of that. And in this particular case and I say this because most of the legislative discussion of tax incentives has been aimed primarily at...manufacturing properties this year. In this particular case we recognized the benefits that flow from investment rather than investment is in residential property, or multi-family residential property, commercial property or industrial property. It's in short an effort to, alright in some cases stimulate new jobs through manufacturing investment in other cases revive central business districts by encouraging people to make investment in commercial property and in still other cases to revive blighted residential neighborhoods by encouraging people to improve their homes."

Skinner: "Would you provide some legislative intent with regard to the percentage figures for the tax credit, are they maximum figures, are they mandatory at that level? How would they be determined?"

Vinson: "There...the purpose of the Amendment is to

say...that the percentage figures are maximums, and that a county which feels that the revenue loss from those maximums would be excessive, but still wants to provide an incentive could as long as they stayed below the maximum, choose other figures."

Skinner: "Why do you think a county board should be allowed to cut taxes for another unit of local government? Which I believe would result if your Bill were implemented."

Vinson: "I think one of the problems with not only the Illinois Revenue System but also the Illinois Local Governmental System is that it's so fragmented. It's...extraordinarily difficult as I think a lot of us would like to do to decentralize decision making in this state, because the structure is so decentralized at the local level. And by going to the county boards, I think we go to a...governmental unit which has some general scope, which has some regional size and which can provide this kind of system in a rather systematic and geographically widespread way. I think that by going to the boards you use the counties in this case, as a laboratory for experimentation. And perhaps we're going to find out that this whole theory, that you can stimulate the economy, stimulate investments your tax incentives is wrong. I don't think we have to take the expedient to find that out of imposing something that might turn out to be wrong on the whole state. Let's engage in an experiment, compare those counties which provide the larger incentives with those which perhaps don't provide for any or provide for smaller ones. And see where the

stimulation's greatest and if in fact the theory, the tax incentives for investments stimulate the economy, it's true."

Skinner: "Thank you very much, for your enlightening comments."

Vinson: "Thank you, appreciate your support, Representative."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Just a few moments on this. I don't know why we have to spend so much energy on Mickey Mouse proposals like this. It wasn't heard in Committee. The questions that were asked by Cal Skinner were good ones, if you were listening, you'd realize this is not only unconstitutional but has a potential for a great deal of mischief. It could virtually destroy local school districts, by having a county board decide to curry favor with tax payers by giving these credits. It just, I don't know why we have to suffer with this sort of stuff. I would hope that we destroy this Bill because it has this terrible Amendment on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich. Terzich, pardon me."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, could I move the previous question on this unconstitutional Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question shall be put. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it the motion carries. Representative Keane, to close."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for the Membership's support on this Bill. There are two

different items in the Bill. We will have time to look at the constitutionality and look at the Bill more thoroughly...in...if..if the Bill...when the Bill goes over to the Senate. I would ask for your support, until that time.....I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I do just want to point out that the Vinson amendment is detrimental to local school districts. It does really impact, I know on that great show between...the 'Sammy and Bob Show'...when they set up that nice dialog and had that 'Q and A' session, in which one would ask a question which was a set up for an answer. It indicated that the school district would not be impacted. The fact is, they will be. It will reduce the local tax base, substantially. And during that dialog, I thought most people would pick up on that, and see it for the ludicrous nature that it was. The fact is that you ought to be very conscious of that and you to realize that it's going to have a severe impact and Representative Mugalian's references to the county board...currying in favor with the taxpayers at the expense of the local school district is very relevant and very real...This is a...kill this vote, I would certainly...regrettably, I see it's going to fly. But it's a bad Bill, and if you want to be voting properly, red is the vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take

the record. On this question there's 110 'aye', and 30 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page...Supplemental Calendar number one. 1799."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1799. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the State Employee Group Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman. Where is it?"

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1799, first addresses a very narrow problem. There are some retired employees about 75 in number, who work for the University of Illinois Cooperative Extension Service, which was a joint project to the Federal government, the university system, or state and local governments. Under a Federal Act these employees had to go under the federal pension system however, the Federal government provides funds for them to go into our health system. This gives authority for them...for these retirees to go into the our Group Health Insurance. All of the premiums will be paid for by the Federal Government. So there was no cost to the State of Illinois. But will be a...an advantage to older employees. A second amendment was placed on the Bill which provides that the survivors of employees who are annuitants will be able to take up \$2,000...up to \$2,000 of life insurance coverage, but on a contributory program. So that they, and they alone will be required to pay the premiums that also will have no direct cost to the state except perhaps some slight impact on...on previous but probably very

insignificant in the number we're talking about. Finally, a..another provision is on the Bill which provides for a limited authority to negotiate diagnostic dental and vision care and diagnos...and preventative vision and diag...dental care. That's what 1799 is about. I'd ask a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of...of the House. It's not very often that I agree Representative Greiman but he's exactly right in this and I urge and 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Hallock."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallock...Representative Greiman."

Hallock: "How many people does this affect?"

Greiman: "The major portion of the Bill, about 75 people, who are retirees of the University of Illinois. Who are the retirees of the cooperative."

Hallock: "The average age is about what, of those retirees?"

Greiman: "Well, you know they're retirees, so they're all over 65, I suppose."

Hallock: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 142 'aye', and 5 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. On page 3 on the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading. There's Senate Bill 1868, is

that right, Representative Braun? Representative Braun. Is it 1303, I've written over the number. I can't read it. 1303?"

Braun: "1303, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "1303."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1303, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill to help the working poor. Right now, to get any medical assistance at all, you have to be a public-aid recipient or spend a great percentage of your limited income first, before the state will help with medical payment. This Bill will allow people who work, people who are poor, to get help with those medical bills. It separates the standards for medical indigency from the standards for welfare. Right now, they are the same. This Bill raises the income eligibility for medical assistance from \$4,200 a year annually for a family of four to \$5,600 a year. It will have state-wide impact and will apply to all hospitals, public or private. I encourage your...your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any...Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, she will."

Hallock: "What's the estimate of the first year cost of this program, do you know?"

Braun: "Thank you, Representative Hallock. The Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid indicates that the

annual cost, which is different that the first year cost, will be in the neighborhood of \$50,000,000 for the state. The first year cost will be significantly less than that."

Hallock: "Well, then what is the cost in subsequent years?"

Braun: "The annual cost, the figure I use for you which is one hundred and one point 2 million dollars as estimated by the department...by the Legislative Advisory Committee."

Hallock: "And of that amount, which...how much of that will be going to Cook County Hospital...or any?"

Braun: "It is indicated in the Department of Public Aid projection that...about two-thirds...a little less than two-thirds. It will however, have state-wide impact and will allow the providing of services of some 71...71,000 eligible persons in downstate Illinois."

Hallock: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This appears to be one more good idea and a costly one at that. We here in the General Assembly, from time to time have to fund good ideas and we do that very well. But we have to reach a point where we also have to stop and say we can't fund them any longer. We can't afford every good idea that comes down the pike. This one seems to be a good idea but it also helps out directly and most of all, Cook County. Not the hospitals downstate, but Cook County Hospital. I would say to you, here tonight, that this is one idea which we should cut back on. Not support, and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Reilly. Representative Boucek, would you sit down?"

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...it's a standard cliché to say that you rise reluctantly to oppose a Bill, but that's true in this case. There's no question that it's...we need to deal with the problems of working poor people in fact perhaps that's one of the great problems both in the state and in our country that we must deal with. I must say and I apologize, I have a call in for our staff person. The figures we have on this side of the aisle are quite different and I'm not enough of an expert on this question to know why...the figures we have indicate that the cost would be 86.9 million dollars, the first year. And 298 million for each subsequent year. I personally do not know why those differences occur. 50% federal reimbursement is available, which apparently, I guess, means that's free money, which brings the cost to the state to 43 million the first year and 150 million dollars for each year thereafter. It seems to me both as a way to help the working poor who unquestionably need help in some sort of overall reform of the welfare system. And as a way to help Cook County Hospital, this is a tremendously inefficient sort of appropri...sort of a Bill....sort of substantive Bill. And for us to be considering this kind of expenditure whichever side's figures turn out to be exactly correct. At a time when we're struggling in these last days of the Session, with the cost of living increase for welfare recipients with questions of support for Cook County Hospital with questions of support for various agencies in the city for questions of support primarily with the schools which we're going to be

debating and perhaps we'll back here in July in Special Session to deal with. It simply seems to me that the inappropriate, it seems to me that this is a problem we must deal with. Senate Bill 1803 does not deal with these problems in a realistic way, it's too costly by either set of figures and I would urge a negative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...anybody for anything further? Representative Catania."

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

I rise in support of this legislation. Illinois now has a medicaid eligibility level which is lower than that of any of the other Northern industrial states, except Ohio. It's lower than that in any of the surrounding states, including Missouri, if you can believe that. And it is certainly true that a lot of us are trying to help Cook County Hospital but this does help other hospitals as well. It will help hospitals in many of the districts of many of the people here on the House floor. You should also know that the Senate today refused to provide enough votes to pass 2793 which was the Bill that this House passed out hoping to help Cook County Hospital a bit more directly. So this is a fair and appropriate Bill to pass to put the state of Illinois in a humane position or at least something closer to a humane position with regard to the working poor and at the same time to help our hospitals to serve the working poor survive. I hope you will vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker I would just like to request that I be

given the opportunity to verify this Roll Call, if it receives 89 votes...thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "You know I'll always give you that opportunity."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Always according to rules. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I too rise to support this good legislation. Representative Hallock admits that it's a good idea, he's concerned that it's an idea before it's time. Its an idea not before its time, in Wisconsin, in Michigan, in California, in New York, in many of the industrial states as Representative Catania has pointed out, currently our maximum eligibility level is the lowest among the Northern industrial states, across the nation. There is some concern about the cost estimate. The Department of Public Aid says this Bill will be very expensive for the State of Illinois. The Legislative Advisory Council Committee, on the other hand, says that it will be a reasonable not overly expensive proposition for us to engage in right now. I'm not surprised the Department of Public Aid cost estimate is so high. The Department of Public Aid cost estimate are always overwhelmingly high. The Department of Public Aid and the Bureau of the Budget in the State of Illinois specialize in telling us that any of ideas....of our ideas are, in fact, going to be far too expensive for this state to participate in. I think that we know from the past what happened with department estimates, for example in the case load

budgeting in the Department of Public Aid line item appropriation consistently the department has been way overboard in terms of the cost of that program. We're talking about how and whether we can help Cook County Hospital and what proportion of the new dollars will go to Cook County Hospital. I would remind you that one of the reasons, one of the reasons that the initial monies are likely to go somewhat disproportionately to go to Cook County Hospital is because the working poor can only go to Cook County and other public hospitals in order to have their health needs met. Private hospitals now will take medicaid patients, green card patients but they reject the people who have no visible means of paying their medical bills. If this money will go to Cook County Hospital it's only because and to the extent that it is only Cook County and other public hospitals that right now are substantially available to serve the needs of the working poor. There are of course private hospitals right now, who are helping to serve that population. That population will not only have better health care if its needs are to be met in this fashion, but it will also have an option as to which hospital, how it will find its medical needs served. I think this is not just a good idea as Representative Hallock suggested it is an idea whose time has come and I urge an 'yes' vote on Senate Bill 1808."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich...Friedrich."

Friedrich D: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill has a lot of appeal and certainly what those people that are speaking for it...is true and I don't think

anybody can deny that. The problem is that last year the legislature reduced the revenue of the state by 70 million dollars because of...a..feeled (sic) that the cost of food was a burden on the poor. This year we're going to take another 70 million off. Now, here's is...is a project or a program that's going to cost 100 million dollars a year. Well, we finally get down to the bottom line where we have already appropriated as...my understanding almost a billion dollars more than the anticipated revenue. These programs are fine but there's no Santa Claus so do you want to vote for a tax increase, do you want to go into deficit spending or what are you going to do? When you take on a new program, that cost 100 million dollars a year, you better be looking for someplace to find the money."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise to support this measure. Not only will it help the working poor, but I want to remind you that in Illinois we have an ever increasing unemployment rate. Which many of the people will have reduced incomes and this will help them. Many of which will have only the hospitals, like, County to resort to in times of need."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. One thing that has to be kept in mind, in evaluating this proposal is that it applies state wide. This is not a proposal to bailout Cook County Hospital or to provide any special impaction assistance for them. It is a new state-wide program for...that would apply to every

recipient and every hospital throughout the state. What that means is, is that the aid is not rifle shot at Cook County, which has a serious problem and which I believe the Department has improperly treated on occasion. I have come to the point despite opposition last year, for I would support and have supported in votes on this floor this year, a particular form of assistance for Cook County Hospital. I believe that assistance has to be so tailored that we provide assistance directly to the problem. And that problem is Cook County, which is so heavily impacted by the working poor. Now the problem with this Bill is spreading the assistance across the state. We impose an enormous cost burden on the state, approaching almost 300 million dollars a year when the program is fully implemented. And we provide very little of that assistance, I believe less than 20% of it, to Cook County Hospital. That's highly inefficient. I have capable and would sit here and vote for 25, 30 maybe 50 million dollars of aid for Cook County Hospital, and did a few weeks ago. But would do that again. But I can't vote for a Bill that totally destroys the future fiscal viability of this state, in order to help Cook County Hospital..aid..hospital only marginally. Now, I think the one other point that people ought to keep in mind when they look at this particular Bill, is that we're authorizing a program here and if we're going to authorize a program we ought to fund that program. We can't fund that program because the appropriation for that program was defeated yesterday in the Senate. And anybody who has

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 25, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

worked with the Senate upon appropriation problems this year, knows how cantankerous they can be. For those reasons I would urge a 'no' vote on this, and would reiterate the intention of this side to verify it. And urge people to only vote their own switch."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone further? Represet...who? Swanstrom...Representative Swanstrom."

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

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

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. This Bill will provide an incentive to people to remain self-sustaining and still be able to receive medical assistance. It does affect the working poor, it affects those people that we say time and time again we are most concerned about. Those who are least able to pay hospital bills out of their pocket and who because they make a minute amount of dollars over the Public Aid standard, are not otherwise eligible for medical assistance. With regard to the efficiency of the methods, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that this is the most efficient way to provide medical services to the working poor. It is a state-wide program. It is not targeted to a single hospital, it affects all hospitals. Furthermore, it will bring into the state coffers additional dollars that we are presently losing because we are not right now getting the benefits of federal financial participation, to the extent that it's available to this state. Second, I

want...I would pose the question, who picks up the cost? You know we've said, time and time again on this House floor there is no such thing as a free lunch. To the extent that hospitals are presently serving people, who cannot pay their hospital bills. They are passing those costs along to us. They are passing those costs along in terms of higher hospital costs, they are passing those costs along in terms of higher hospital bills. That is a major problem, the private pay patients, the...the personal pay patient or the private insurance..insured patient, eventually winds up picking up the cost of people who cannot pay services provided in the private sector. Finally, I would point out that it...that this again is not a Cook County situation alone, but I would assure those of you who have any reservations about that institution that the new management there has cleaned up some of the abuses. They...it has taken care of some of the problems that we experienced last year. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this program is...is..is a reasonable one, it is a workable one, and by the way, I would point out that many other states use a system in which the level of medical indigency is separated from the level of welfare eligibility. That is what this Bill does it says you may be...you may have a certain income state figure to be eligible for welfare but if you make more than that if you have a job, if you work, and still cannot afford medical services within limits, that is to say within the limits of 56 hundred dollars for a family of four. This state will assist in the payment of

your medical costs. I encourage your favorable vote, on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I really don't understand the rationale of saying when a Bill of this sort is presented, that we shouldn't deal with the issue on the basis of the issue. That we ought to instead simply to address those particular facilities that are having extraordinary kinds of problems. That sounds to me like a very paternalistic kind of attitude where we are expecting that we will force hospitals to their knees so that they will have to come with their hands out, suggesting that they need additional state funds from the...the Legislature, in order to put them back on an even keel. I don't believe that is the way we ought to be going. Here is a method by which, we can help those people, who are out there trying to help themselves. The people who are trying to stay off Welfare, are trying to make it on their own but need an extra little bit of assistance. The Federal Government is willing to help to provide that, but we as a state have to be able to gear up to do under the federal standards. I think we ought to be doing that rather than suggesting that people ought to be brought to their knees individually or that hospitals ought to be brought their knees, so that they can come begging for help. I don't think that's the way we should operate

state government. I think we should instead be setting policies so that we can help the working poor and so that we can help our medical providers to help those working poor without expecting an undue expense to them as providers."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Henry."

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, recently I spoke with a young fellow on the other side of the aisle that was hobbling along the corridors with a broken leg, with a cast around his leg. Now, this individual insurance is paid by the state, to pay the hospital for his treatment. What we're trying to deal with the ones that are unfortunate, the ones that are unemployed, the ones that needs the help, and it's just so strange Mr. Speaker, that the persons that are living off the state, with free medical care from the state cannot help those who are trying to help themselves. That's why I vote 'yes', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Alexander."

Alexander: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and to the Ladies and Gentlemen of this House. In February of this year, I had to enter the hospital. I carried a Cook County State...and county paid insurance policy. And of course, as being a legislator the as same as you here I was covered by the state policy. I received my bill about two months ago and as I sit down and pondered over and looked at it, I still owed the hospital better than a thousand dollars. And I make the same salary as most of you all do here, 28 thousand dollars a year. I been a working person all of my life. And I can relate to that working poor out there, who

salaries run from 4 to 5 thousand dollars a year. When they have illnesses such as I have had, and other Members of this have had and have had to meet these heavy debt obligations. I urge you to give this a green vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to ask for a 'yes' vote on behalf of the Illinois taxpayer at the present time we provide medical care for our citizens but we do not take full advantage of the federal financial participation available. The Aud. Auditor General has carefully documented this in his...in a management audit study. Dated January, 1980. It states, 'the state does not provide categorical assistance to all those who would be federally eligible. These costs are being borne at the present time, one hundred percent by the citizens of the state of Illinois. We need to put forth effort and IDPA needs to put forth effort to analyze ultimate funding mechanisms for these health care services. On behalf of the Illinois taxpayer, let's take whatever steps we can to get all the federal money available to us. Vote 'yes', for Senate Bill 1803 and help all of the taxpayers in your Legislative District."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz desires to be recorded 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Explaining my 'aye' vote, I think that Representative Vinson made some very good points. This just doesn't affect Cook County Hospital, it

affects the entire state. So it's not a bailout for Cook County Hospital. What it will do, is perhaps make it easier for us to avoid a bailout for Cook County Hospital. And you know each year we have to come back and ask for more help. Now, I know that the Republicans who are not voting for this...they can't say that it's not in the budget. As my good friend, Dwight Friedrich said earlier, the Bureau of the Budget doesn't appropriate money, the Legislature does. We're the ones that make the decisions. Other good points have been raised, is that it brings in money, it brings in the federal money. And these people are not people on welfare, these are the people who are working. And if they don't get these benefits it would seem to encourage them to go back on Welfare. It just really doesn't make sense, to say that we can't afford it, because I really feel that we can. So I encourage those of you who are not voting or voting 'no' to switch to 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "This vote...this Bill is not going to pass without more Republican votes. That's clear, you can't expect every Democrat to be present and voting. So it's going to need some votes from the other side of the aisle which bleed so much for big businessmen. Doesn't seem to have any concern about those who cannot afford to pay their medical bills, who are less fortunate than we are. I hope that the newspapers note the vote...the to vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Representative Borchers."

Jorchers: "Yes,...hold on."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 79 'aye' and 68 'no', Representative Braun."

Braun: "Poll of the Absentees, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Lady's requested a Poll of the Absentees, poll the Absentees, Mr. Clerk...Lechowicz, Representative Lechowicz has requested to be recorded as 'aye' when he was standing down here."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Breslin. Capparelli. Capuzi. Flinn. Huskey. Krska. Laurino. Leverenz. Mautino. McCourt. Meyer. Pechous. Schlickman. Slape. Stearney. Telcser. Terzich. Watson. Williams, and Winchester."

Speaker Redmond: "80 'aye', 68 'no', this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority hereby declared lost. On Supplemental Calendar #2 appears Senate Bill Third Reading, Senate Bill 569. Representative Hoffman has filed a motion with respect to Senate Bill 569. Representative Gene Hoffman. Gene Hoffman. Yeah...there's a motion. Take this out of the record temporarily. On page five of the Regular Calendar, Consideration Postponed. Senate Bill 1822, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I asked leave to return Senate Bill 1822 from Consideration Postponed, to the Order of Second Reading, for the purpose of withdrawing an amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell..."

Yourell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I asked leave to..."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman requests leave to return it to the Order of Second Reading. Does he have leave?"

Hearing no objection, leave is granted.
Representative Yourell. On Second Reading."

Yourell: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there was a great deal of discussion and obvious controversy about Senate Bill...relative to Senate Bill...Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1822. Those of you who engaged in the debate, recall Amendment #1 was really the House Bill 307, in it's original form which was the burden of proof legislation that we considered and passed out of the House in 1979. Since there seems to be a great deal of opposition to that theory and that concept, I would ask now, that we withdraw that Amendment so that we can consider 1822, a very important bill, that I hope and believe that everybody is...feels it's important. The Governor is for the bill, and with this Amendment off perhaps we can precede with 1822."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Having voted on the prevailing side, Mr. Speaker, I now...I move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #1 was adopted to Senate Bill 1822."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved to reconsider the vote, by which Amendment #1 was adopted. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 100 'aye' and 1 'no', Motion carried, the vote by which Amendment One was adopted is reconsidered.
Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, now what is the posture of Senate Bill 1822?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, you have to move...it's on Second Reading and you have to move to table Amendment #2. Amendment One, rather."

Yourell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I now move to table Amendment #1, to Senate Bill 1822."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1822. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carried, Amendment's tabled. Representative Yourell. And now, any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Repre...back to Consideration Postponed. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker now, with leave of the House, I'd like to consider Senate Bill 1822 on Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Yourell: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield the floor to Representative Reilly, who is the chief Sponsor of Senate Bill 1822."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, 1822 is now back in the form from which it came from the Senate. At that point it was an agreed Bill between the Governor's Office, the Secretary of State's Office and the Joint Committee. The primary feature is it requires that we ask tonight, is that we do not come October 1st, the various agencies of state government will have to publish a compilation of their rules. This removes that deadline and will save a considerable amount of money not to mention paper work and...and time for the

various state agencies. So, on behalf of Representative Yourell and myself, I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. Senate Bills, Third Reading. Page two of the Regular Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1643, Representative Kornowicz. Kornowicz. You want to call 1643? One, six, four, three. No. On Senate Bills, Third Reading, Senate Bill 1957, Representative Stuffle...Representative Stuffle on 1957....Out of the Record. How about 2022? Representative Reilly."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2022. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Human Rights Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2022 as it came over from the Senate extended from five to ten days the period of time in which the Commission can issue a restraining order...excuse me, in which a court can issue a restraining order at the request of the Commission. In the Judiciary Committee an Amendment was added to that, that adds a version of what is known by the code name as least of private right of action, though I am not sure that is exactly the right description. What the Amendment does is say that a party that...whose complaint is not processed within the various time limits which total up to three

hundred days by the department that that person can then, if they choose, go into court. This does several things. It puts some pressure on the department, at least the Sponsors of the Amendment hope it does, to meet its time limits which was always a complaint about the FEPC. Secondly, it makes sure that the people in the department can't somehow deny someone ultimately whatever redress of grievances they may have. I am sure there is going to be some debate on this and I will save other remarks that I may have for closing. Just let me make one point that I wish everyone would pay attention to. There has been some rumor going all day that this Bill was somehow going to become a vehicle for the appropriation for the department. Let me say absolutely that that is not correct. I give you my word that is not correct. There is absolutely no reason we would want to use this for a vehicle for the appropriation, and so you have my assurance that that is true. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, for a fear that there may be some problems that arise in objection to this particular Bill...and I wish that you would vote 'no' on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Well, I don't know what the last Gentleman's reasons for a 'no' vote would be, but this Bill provides some very important relief. At this point, that agency can essentially ignore a...the complaint that has been filed, or at least the claim that has

been filed, and what we have is a...an Amendment which allows an individual who is ignored by that Commission to take a right of action after three hundred days. And what we're saying is that if three hundred days go by, if the agency doesn't file a complaint or...order no complaint to be filed, if it ignores an act of discrimination, then that individual has a right of action. I think it would be shameful...shameful indeed, not to pass this Bill tonight. I am going to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Huff."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Huff: "Well, Representative Reilly,...Representative Reilly, on page four, line sixteen, it says that the complainant may make demands in writing at any time upon the department for an authorization supposedly to go into court after the three hundred days. What happens if the department refuses to give such an authorization?"

Reilly: "If it is not received within ten days, then the complainant can file the action anyway."

Huff: "I didn't hear you, Sir."

Reilly: "If it's not received within ten days, the authorization is not received within ten days, the complainant may file an action anyway without the written authorization."

Huff: "All right. In the Section dealing with...on page three, dealing with conc...conciliation, in Section F, where...after conciliation refer...conference where there appears to be...a failure to settle or adjust

any charges through a conciliation, what would be the relief then?"

Reilly: "well, in the first place, that is not being changed...I mean that...the Amendment doesn't...the Bill itself doesn't affect that at all. That's what the law is..."

Huff: "I know that, but I am asking what would be the relief where there is a failure in the conciliation conference?"

Reilly: "If the conciliation conference fails, then the department reverts to the complaint procedure and processes the complaint. The conciliation conference is simply an attempt to peacefully work out the situation. If that fails, then the department goes ahead and imposes whatever sanctions it is entitled to under the law against the person who has committed the act of discrimination."

Huff: "Mr. Speaker, if I may address the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Huff: "Mr. Speaker, I think that this is another example of why we were opposed to 1377. This piece of legislation is nothing more than another piece of impediment towards the redress of justice. In my opinion, the justice denied...justice delayed is justice denied. It's specious in its concept. It is the greatest rip off since 'PT Barnum' on the credibility of the human mind. I think this Bill deserves no affirmation whatsoever, Ladies and Gentlemen, and should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone...Representative Reilly to close."

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

House. Senate Bill 2022 responds to one of the major demands that we've heard all along that is supposedly the weakness in the Human Rights Act. We heard several. We heard a complaint that the department would be understaffed and underfunded. In a way, we dealt with that question yesterday. We heard that the private right of action was a vital right that was being taken away. Historically that is not at all correct, or at least there is a very simple way of putting it because, in fact, most of what is being put in here is an entirely new right which the legal defense fund tried to put into the FEPC Act unsuccessfully two years ago. Let me review, and I know the House is tired of this issue, and you know, as I guess I made clear yesterday, I am too to some extent. After 1377 was passed, an Implementation Committee was set up. It involved all kinds of groups including and specifically including those who had been critical of 1377. One of the major plans that they wanted included in the law, and one of the major recommendations that came out of the Implementation Committee at their suggestion was this Bill, and this Amendment, and this terminology. This is something that we've been told over and over again in speech after speech after speech after speech on the floor of this House, was vital to the strengthening and improvement and carrying out of the purpose of the Human Rights Act. It seems to me that it is time that we...forget whatever other problems we may have and address ourselves to this which meets one of the major demands, and one of the major suggestion, and one of

GENERAL ASSEMBLY June 25, 1980.
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

the alleged weaknesses in the Act to begin with. I would renew my call for a favorable Roll Call and I would plead with Representative Taylor to change his position. I understand the problems that he has, but this meets a major demand that you have made. It is a good faith effort to meet that and you ought to join with us in passing Senate Bill 2022."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Alexander to explain her vote."

Alexander: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Reilly, I would like to be able to vote on this Bill but you made a statement that I would like to have answered. You said an Implementation Committee met to implement this piece of legislation. And that those persons who were concerned with the implementation got together. I believe most of the objections that have been raised to this civil rights piece of legislation has come out of the House. May I ask you in sincere earnest, who in this House...who raised...who has raised objection to this piece of legislation...was a part of that Implementation Committee so I can intelligently vote?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "From the Implementation Committee were Richard Austin, Alice Tregay, Leon Depres, Lynn Altorfer, Representative Braun, Representative Taylor, Representative Catania, Representative Currie, Senator Netch, John 'Mullen', Gayloyd 'Lo-', the president of Cook County Bar Association, Willis 'Crusoe', Manuel 'Barbosa', and Albert 'Lockridge' from East St. Louis."

Alexander: "Thank you very kindly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, my name was mentioned. I did not serve as a Member of the Implementation Committee due to a death in the family at the time that the Committee met."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Henry."

Henry: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the young Lady that just spoke shows you the light on this Bill that there's been lies spread. There's been rumors sent out. There's been actions by some Members of this House to spread untruths about Bills. Personalities have been brought into attack. This Bill...this Bill needs to go down by 199 to nothing because first of all the person who has a complaint has to take it to a Commission. The Commission may have to sit for three hundred days and then tell the complainant they can't find anything wrong. By that time if the person had any witnesses they would be dead and gone. So, Mr. Speaker, I want to cast a red vote on this Bill."

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

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask my good friend, Representative Reilly, a question. Representative, you indicated in your discourse that there was an Implementation Committee established. I wasn't totally cognizant of that Committee. What was the Committee's charge, and do you know how many times they met?"

Reilly: "Yes, the Committee's charge was to...well, to

recommend whatever legislation was necessary to implement the decisions made in the passage of Senate Bill 1377. We had three meetings. The...basically what we did was go through several documents. We went through the document that was prepared during the time 1377 was considered by the Chicago Council of Lawyers...we also had an in House document that had been prepared by the FEPC listing some technical problems that they saw with the procedure. There was a combined attorneys group...that is civil rights attorneys, and I'm sorry, I don't remember the name of the Committee that met with us...some officials with HUD met with us. We spent one afternoon with them making sure that the Act was in compliance...fully met with the federal housing standards so that...which as you know, has some significance for funding for the state..."

Bullock: "Approximately how many times did they meet, Representative?"

Reilly: "Three."

Bullock: "Three times?"

Reilly: "Yeah."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my position on this Bill. Representative Reilly is probably one of the most diligent Members of this Legislature, and I'd like for the records to show that at no time have I, or anyone, attempted to question his sincerity in the sponsorship of this Bill. He is a conscientious, diligent lawmaker. Obviously, in this position, he is representing the administration...the Thompson administration and is endeavoring to put forth the

posture for that administration. The legislation in question here makes a confession, a confession that meets one of the most critical concerns that have been raised with regards to removing criminal penalties in access to the courts in the civil rights statute. My colleagues, on the other hand, have expressed some concern. They have expressed some unreadiness, and I certainly am sort of perplexed in this posture. And so, I can't really vote 'no' on the measure and neither can I vote 'aye'. But I would like for the record to show that I am voting 'present', and I am doing so because I think the Sponsor is making a conscientious effort to represent the Thompson administration."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 74 'aye' and 43 'no'. And this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Supplemental Calendar #2, Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bill 569. Representative Hoffman is recognized."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On the Order of Motions, I move to suspend the provisions of Rule 35C with respect to this Bill. We amended this Bill today, and therefore I need to suspend this rule, in order to hear House Bill 569, and I would ask for your support for my motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brunner."

Brunner: "Yes, it seems to me, I've seen that number on the board all last night and all today and I still can't remember what the content of the Bill is."

Hoffman: "It's...it's the content of the Bill is the Chicago School Finance Authority program."

Brunner: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "We're on the motion to suspend the provisions of Rule 35C. Those in favor of Representative Hoffman's motion, indicate by voting 'aye' and opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 108 'aye' and 27 'no', the motion carries. Representative Hoffman on Senate Bill 569."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 569 includes the authority for the Chicago School Finance Authority to sell an additional 73 million dollars worth of...of bonds which...which 45 million must go for working cash fund. It provides the mechanism for the working cash fund function, as well as included in the Bill is an amendment proposed by Representative Henry, Huff and Bullock to...to create a Chicago Community School Study Commission...to look at the possibility of...of the realignment of the school district for the city of Chicago." And I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Read the Bill. Representative Skinner."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 569. A Bill for an Act to amend sections of the School Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "...or more formally, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's got Skinner's microphone? Proceed."

Skinner: "What we're doing here is following the abysmal example of New York City and financing with long term debt, short term...short term expenses. This is just incredible. Even for '1040' on the dead...on the night of the deadline for passing such incredible Bills. Representative Leinenweber could put it better than I but in his absence...he stepped out for just a minute...I will suggest that what we are doing here is either mandating a tax increase for the city of Chicago or mandating a raid on the federal fund of the state of Illinois. One cannot continually finance the Chicago's school system out of commercial paper. Eventually one has to come up with cash to pay off the loans that will be...that will be made. And I don't see why the city of Chicago constitute...school board, and their legislators, its legislators cannot decide to do that starting right now. Bite the bullet, Gentlemen. You either do it now or you do it later but given the fact that I guess, most of the school board members and most of the legislators are politicians and most politicians think about the short run rather than the long term. I guess you'll wait for your successors to bite the bullet. And not do it today, incidentally if this gets more than 114 votes, total, 'aye', 'no' and 'present', I'm going to verify the Roll Call. That's all there were on the Civil Rights...or the Human Rights Department Bill. On the motion to...to waive, there were 135 votes. I don't believe there are that many people here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

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

Representative Hoffman, it is my general understanding, and correct me if my simple outline of the situation is in error in any way. That when we last met as a legislature, we were under...led to believe that the Chicago School System would trim about 100 million out of their budget. Then they went back home and sat down with the teacher's unions...union and a few other unions and involved participants and they said, 'no we're not going to allow you cut that amount of money, you go back and try to get more money at Springfield'. And so this Bill is the effort to get more money from Springfield. Is that about what happened?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman. Representative Deuster has raised a question."

Deuster: "Representative Hoffman was in conference, I guess."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, he was with Representative Skinner, back there talking to him."

Deuster: "Well, if Representative Skinner would leave him alone, I'd like to ask him a question. Representative Hoffman, my understanding is that we were led to believe by Mr. 'Van Gorkham' and everyone else involved. When we last dealt with this crisis that the Chicago School System needed to cut 100 million dollars out of their budget. When they went back and took a second look at that, the teacher unions, union rather and other trade organizations involved, said absolutely not, we can't live with that kind of a budget cut you go back to Springfield since the Legislature is in Session, try and get some money down

there. And that is why we are here with this legislation. Is that an accurate description of the scenario, or if not why are we doing this?"

Hoffman: "That...is to the best of my judgment not an accurate description of the scenario. Let me attempt to deal with that issue. At the time we enacted the legislation with the 500 million dollars we thought that..or they thought that the proceeds from that levy would be larger than they turned out to be because of the increased cost of...of the interest rate and the funding of the program. That is what the 28 million, which will net 25 is all about. The other is the establishment of the working cash fund because as they got into it with their accountants they found as they went down the line even with the issuing of the bonds that in January or February of the coming year they would have a...a cash shortage and the purpose for establishing a working cash fund was to level that out. They described the working cash fund in such way that that money would have to be paid back within 11 months, as you'll see in the amendment, to the...to the Chicago School Finance Authority. That is the description of the rationale for this. "

Deuster: "Is it not true that they were going to cut 100 million but they declined or were not able to do that?"

Hoffman: "I'm sorry...someone else was...repeat.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson was bothering him, everybody stop bothering Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Representative Schneider did you hear the question, want to respond to it?"

Deuster: "The question was, we understood they were going cut about 100 million from the budget and is it accurate to say that they declined to do that, and if so why did they decline what we all expected to be cut from the budget."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Deuster...oh..Schneider."

Schneider: "Just tell him you went to sleep at the switch, Rodney."

Speaker Redmond: "I didn't recognize you without your tie."

Schneider: "Oh...I want to point out..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schneider: "On that question, I think Don, the...the intentional...the intention of the Authority with the Board was to reduce the budget by 60 million this year, 101 or 102 by next year. And I think from the conversations we've had over this hearing as well as recently they're pretty close on track with that. So I guess the only assurance I can give you and I certainly don't speak for the city of Chicago or the Chicago schools is that based on my experience as a Co-chairman of that committee we are...we saw the package they brought in, we found it was too comprehensive, I think that the money request are reasonable, they did reduce the request from 100 million down to 73, at the insistence of the Senators and the Members of the House who were there at our hearing. I think they've made a good faith effort in two areas than one to reduce the waste, quote, unquote, also to give us some actual information on what they thought would be reasonable dollar bonding request."

Hoffman is correct, on the motion that the cost of money increased so dramatically over last year. That the proceeds that the bond sales would yield were not adequate and I understand that is the reason why they are back for that request."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just to explain my vote. This is a critical bill for the Chicago Public Schools. The Chicago School Finance Authority in conjunction with the Chicago School Board has worked well, closely and with an interest for the best things for the community and the schools, in trying to fix some of the problems of the Chicago School Boards got itself into last year. All this Bill does is say that that Chicago School Finance Authority can extend its bonding power by an additional 70 some million dollars. It also establishes for the School Finance Authority not for the Chicago School Board a working cash fund. The School Finance Authority has no place else to go for its working cash needs except to bond money. Those of you who are concerned that this is the wrong way to fund a railroad, should remember that this is a special creation of this General Assembly, and there is really no option except to go to a working cash fund. We need this kind of authority for the Chicago School Finance Authority if we are going to be able to work ourselves out of the financial mess and at the same time have any prospects of educating

our children. This General Assembly prides itself on a concern for education on finding the wherewithal in the Governor's budget in order to be able to see to it that our schools across the state are properly funded. This particular Bill will not use any of our tax dollars, it will not use one single cent of state money. All it says to the Chicago School System is yes, you have an opportunity to raise the funds you need in order to be able to do the job now. I urge many more green votes on that board."

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

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies in the House...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I could understand those red votes if this was state dollars we were talking about, I could understand those red votes if we were asking your school system, your district to cough up some extra money for the Chicago School System. But no, you know our school system is in trouble, we all know that it has been an abomination, we are in a....attempting in Chicago to take care of our own problems with our schools. We are attempting to get a fresh start, we got a new board, we've got a new Finance Authority, we are trying to put the pieces back together to make the school the largest single school district in this city work. Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, your help definitely needed just to authorize us to take care of our own problems. We have no place else to go, as Representative Currie says, we are in need of some additional as...we are in need to go to the private sector so that we can work

together in Chicago to put a damaged system back together. We...I encourage more 'aye' votes up there, so we can do the job in Chicago for our schools."

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

Wolf J.J.: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just ask for a couple of more affirmative lights and let me explain position, hopefully..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson. Representative Bowman. Representative J. J. Wolf. "

Wolf J.J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just going to say, Mr. Speaker, we'd like a few more green lights, we're ~~not asking any money for the...from the State~~ Treasury. We're looking for some additional bonding authority for the Chicago Board of Education, as you well know it's in great financial straight, and it just seems to me, it's like somebody going to the bank and borrowing some money to help a business that's been having some problems. If you...you may go under for being a few dollars short because you didn't ask for enough money. This is no cost to downstate people it's just giving them a chance to help themselves. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 93 'aye' and 50 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you've prided yourself on obeying the rules for so far this Session and you've have in part, or at largely, done so. I told you that if over 114 people were registered as voting, I wanted to verify it. There are clearly more than 114 people

voting. There are not clearly more than 114 people here."

Speaker Redmond: "I didn't hear you, Sir. I would've granted you the verification, but I did not hear you."

Skinner: "Well, I assure you, I said in."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I didn't hear it."

Skinner: "Then you're denying a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Skinner: "Well, that's unethical, Mr. Speaker, certainly Bob Blair would've allowed a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we now adjourn until tomorrow at the hour of 10:30 A.M."

Speaker Redmond: "You heard the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed, 'no', the 'ayes' have it. Motion carried, the House now stands adjourned until 10:30 tomorrow morning."

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 25, 1980

PAGE

HB-0024	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	225
HB-2924	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	234
HB-3048	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	237
HB-3070	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	237
HB-3616	1ST READING	PAGE	222
HB-3617	1ST READING	PAGE	223
SB-0569	2ND READING	PAGE	68
	2ND READING	PAGE	283
	3RD READING	PAGE	341
	MOTIONS	PAGE	99
	MOTIONS	PAGE	295
	MOTIONS	PAGE	340
SB-1378	3RD READING	PAGE	145
SB-1457	3RD READING	PAGE	146
SB-1497	3RD READING	PAGE	147
SB-1524	2ND READING	PAGE	100
	3RD READING	PAGE	304
	MOTIONS	PAGE	298
SB-1541	3RD READING	PAGE	151
SB-1543	3RD READING	PAGE	159
SB-1544	3RD READING	PAGE	159
SB-1545	3RD READING	PAGE	175
SB-1571	2ND READING	PAGE	19
SB-1574	2ND READING	PAGE	10
SB-1575	2ND READING	PAGE	12
SB-1576	2ND READING	PAGE	16
SB-1629	2ND READING	PAGE	22
SB-1630	3RD READING	PAGE	31
SB-1666	3RD READING	PAGE	181
SB-1706	3RD READING	PAGE	33
SB-1726	3RD READING	PAGE	36
SB-1729	3RD READING	PAGE	183
	MOTIONS	PAGE	210
SB-1739	3RD READING	PAGE	239
SB-1762	3RD READING	PAGE	43
SB-1799	3RD READING	PAGE	313
SB-1808	3RD READING	PAGE	315
SB-1812	3RD READING	PAGE	44
SB-1822	2ND READING	PAGE	329
	3RD READING	PAGE	331
	MOTIONS	PAGE	330
SB-1828	2ND READING	PAGE	131
	3RD READING	PAGE	306

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 25, 1980

PAGE 2

SB-2019	2ND READING	PAGE	142
SB-2022	3RD READING	PAGE	332
HR-0921	1ST READING	PAGE	223

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 25, 1980

PAGE 3

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND-HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. KRUEGER-PRAYER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
CHANGE OF VOTES	PAGE	2
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	6
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	7
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	10
RECESS	PAGE	222
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	222
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	222
CHANGE OF VOTES	PAGE	223
SPEAKER REDMOND-HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	225
HOUSE STANDS ADJOURNED	PAGE	349
