

Doorkeeper: "All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. We'll be led in prayer this morning by Jack O'Brien, the Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Let us pray. Lord, bless this House and all those that serve and work here. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Reading of the Journal."

Clerk O'Brien: "Wednesday, June 9, 1976. The House met pursuant to adjournment, the Speaker in the Chair."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the reading of the Journal and will approve the following Journals. Number 159 for June 9, 1976; number 160 for June 10, 1976; number 161 for June 11, 1976; number 162 for June 14, 1976; number 163 for June 15, 1976."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. We haven't started that one yet. You've heard the Gentleman's motion. The reading of the Journal is 159, 160, 61, 62, and 63 be disposed of and that those be dispensed with and that those Journals be approved. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The reading of the Journals is dispensed with the Journals are approved. Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the record to show that Representative Campbell is absent due to illness. Representative Campbell was taken to the hospital about midnight this morning or last night. The report this morning is that he's resting comfortably."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none, the record will so show that Representative Campbell is excused for illness. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, would this be a good time to table one of my Bills?"

Speaker Redmond: "Excellent."

Deuster: "I'd like to table House Bill 4001."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved to... asks leave to table House Bill 4001. Any objections? Hearing none, permission



granted. Any similar motions by any other Member? Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I dislike antagonizing the Members of this chamber once again, but it does seem rather futile to continue to carry on the Calendar Bills which will not be able to pass the Senate or shortly will not be allowed to pass the Senate and I would again ask the Speaker if he will not entertain at the present moment my motion to recommit all of the House Bills on Second Reading and Third Reading with the exception of the appropriation Bills, all motions... all of those Bills presently on the Speaker's Table, if he will not consider at this moment if he could give me a time certain where he would or might consider that. I might suggest that the last thirty-two minutes you gave me is now twenty-seven hours and thirty-seven minutes, but I would be willing to make a compromise. I'd be most grateful if you could suggest a time perhaps it might be appropriate to make such a motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lundy, do you desire to speak on Representative Epton's motion?"

Epton: "I would second that motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski is recognized. Representative Grotberg, do you seek recognition on the motion to table all matters not appropriation matters? Representative Epton's Bill."

Grotberg: "Well sure, I would move Mr. Epton's motion on everything except Senate Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton, is there a quorum present?"

Epton: "Yes, I... again, this time I checked with the electrician and I find that the board is in perfect working order and the attendance is more than ample to express the feeling of the House on this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler, do you seek recognition on this matter?"

Birchler: "The board seems to be okay, Mr. Speaker, but the Body seems to be mute."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Am I to understand, Mr. Speaker, as I understand the motion, will carry with a majority of those voting on the question?"

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct. We have a quorum. A majority of those voting is sufficient to carry the motion. The question is on the Gentleman's motion to table all Bills, all motions with the exception of appropriation matters. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed? Roll Call is requested. Representative Barnes 'aye'. Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker, we are talking about House Bills, right?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct."

Grotberg: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "In the list of Bills, there's a Bill that has to do with the operation of the Capital Development Bonding Authority which isn't an appropriation Bill but which is going to be necessary for the orderly and progressive work of state government, so you might be biting off more than you can chew, Mr. Epton."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl."

C.M. Stiehl: "Mr. Speaker, does this mean all Bills, those on the Table, those on Postponed Consideration?"

Speaker Redmond: "Everyplace."

C.M. Stiehl: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly oppose this motion. Why I think, you know, after last night that would be very, very wrong. That'd be a breach of faith really to change this. We're still arguing over a Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative LaFleur."

LaFleur: "Did you announce the result of this motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "Not yet, no. Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Yes, does this include things on the Speaker... Resolutions that are on the Speaker's Table? They've been there for some time."

Speaker Redmond: "It does, it includes them all."

Dyer: "Well, let's all vote 'no'. This is terrible. There's still some very important things that people have been working hard on ever since April."



Speaker Redmond: "Seems to be enough people voting 'yes' though unless those who want to vote 'no'... Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, I would request a Roll Call and I didn't see the board go on, so I don't know how many 'yesses' or 'nos' there are."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn, do you seek recognition?"

Washburn: "I suspect the Roll Call will be taken at a later time."

Speaker Redmond: "At the appropriate time..."

Washburn: "At the appropriate time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I heard Representative Giorgi's ruling that his Bill was exempt, but I hadn't heard your ruling. Would it also include that Capital Development Board Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "It would. It would include the complex in Rockford and all sorts of things. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't rule anything exempt, Mr. Schuneman. All I said was it's a House Bill that has to do with the bonding authority of the Capital Development Bonding Authority and if the House persists in tabling all Bills, we'll just table all Bills and worry about it later."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser, did I hear you substitute motion there to table the House? Representative Epton."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, certainly Members of the Body have raised very valid questions, but I think and especially where a question of our integrity's involved, I think any Member who could show to this House that through some inadvertence on our part, a Bill essential to government or a Bill which was worthy of further consideration should not have been excluded... tabled, I think they probably could get leave of the House. However, rather than divide the question on each individual Bill and take the time of the House, I would submit that we proceed with this motion and at a later time if a Member feels severely wronged by this act, I'm sure that the House would be most considerate of listening to her or his appeal."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Daniels, for what purpose do you rise?"



Daniels: "Well, I didn't arise for any purpose, but standing here I looked at the Calendar..."

Speaker Redmond: "Why should you be any different?"

Daniels: "Yeah, right. And I think that we ought to amend that motion to exclude all Republican sponsored Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "They've been excluded already. Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Well, I think we ought to amend the motion to include all Senate Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that my leader has ever touched a chord that's more responsive to my heart. I heartily concur. It was an inadvertent oversight on my part and I would suggest that perhaps my first motion should have been all Senate Bills and then all House Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Well, yes, I realize that the morning devotion is over; but I think Reverend Epton and Reverend Washburn are now past preaching and they're meddling."

Epton: "I didn't hear that. I'd like to hear the last, we're meddling?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grotberg, would you repeat, please?"

Grotberg: "Yes, I say Reverend Epton, Rabbi Epton and Reverend Washburn, I'm sorry, are past preaching. Now, they're meddling. All I wanted was that first correction, Rabbi Epton. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leon."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker, might I suggest that that motion be held for an hour and a half and then we act on it?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, while we're waiting, deciding what to do with the Senate Bills, I have two on the order of motions. If you'd call it, I could get 'em moved."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you withdraw your motion for a short while, Representative Epton?"

Epton: "I would be happy to do so except it would be a complete breach



of faith to allow my colleague to proceed with Senate Bills when a charming young lady is waiting to proceed with her House Bill. I could under no circumstances countenance and I'm sure that if Representative Leinenweber withdraws his appeal, I would be perfectly willing to wait till a later hour."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber has withdrawn and therefore, we will defer action on your motion till later on. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 926, Washburn. House Resolution 928, Dyer. 929, Schoeberlein. 930, Schlickman. 933, Hirschfeld. 934, D.L. Houlihan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 926 by Washburn notes that the new Galloway Elementary School is named after the Superintendent of schools in that district. 928 by Dyer honors the Illinois Girls State program. 929 by Schoeberlein honors the Emmanuel Lutheran Church of Peoria, of Aurora. 930 by Schlickman honors L.W. (Bill) Calderwood, Chief of Police of the Village of Arlington Heights, retiring after 48 years of service. Resolution 933 by Hirschfeld honors the Boys Illinois State. And House Resolution 934 by Dan Houlihan honors Mrs. Agnes Helen Murphy of Chicago on her 85th birthday. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 927, Polk. Respect to the memory of Dr. Henry Veld. And House Resolution 932, Jaffe. Respect to the memory of Dr. Stanley D. Rothman."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. Further Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 931, Schisler."

Speaker Redmond: "Speaker's Table. House Bills, Second appears



Senate Bill 887."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 887. A Bill for an Act to repeal the Park District Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Grotberg. Amends Senate Bill 887 on page 1 by deleting line 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Yes, because this is an agreed Amendment between Representative Kempiners and myself, we'll Co-sponsors, I'll yield to Representative Kempiners."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1, the Bill that is before us is a repealer of an Act that I passed during the 78th General Assembly and the Amendment is agreed upon and basically what it does relating to park districts and annexation and disconnection is limits the Act that I passed to residential property only. I concur in the need for this in that my Act provided a procedure for people who wanted to leave one district and go into another one and were finding that there had been some land raiding going on. And the Act was passed primarily so that individuals who were dissatisfied could leave and not businesses or wealthy industrial lands, so I would ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Again, Bill, could you please give us a little more definition what the effect of your Amendment as to the whole Bill? I didn't get the full..."

Kempiners: "Sam, it's not so much what it does in my Bill. It's what this Amendment will do to the, the Bill before us, it's what this Amendment will do to the Act I passed in the last General Assembly. We had a situation where people wanted to disconnect from one park district and go into another and I provided a procedure. However, we're finding that there are park districts now which are trying to raid, you know, valuable tax properties from districts. And what this will do would limit



my law from the last Session only to residential property, so that that disconnect and annexation procedure would apply only to residential property and not to other types."

Maragos: "Thank you."

Kempiners: "Yeah, the Amendment is now the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the adoption of the Amendment. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1560, Representative Lucco. 1567, Representative Schuneman."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1567, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees' Group Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1560, Representative Lucco."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1560, a Bill for an Act changing the fees and salaries of Clerks of the Circuit Court. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1707."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1707, a Bill for an Act authorizing the Director of General Services to contract to sell and convey certain real property. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1719."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1719, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the rate of interest. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1739."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1739, a Bill for an Act in relation to the implementation and public library self-insurance plans. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1795, Representative Hart. 1795 out of the record. 1799."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1799. A Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees' Group Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1800."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1800, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees' Group Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1803."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1803, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees' Group Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1804."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1804, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees' Group Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1806."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1806, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."



Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1936, Representative Matijevidh.

1936. Out of the record. 1967, out of the record. 1994."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1994, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the State Comptroller. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1881."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1881, a Bill for an Act to amend the Dangerous Abuse Act. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amends Senate Bill 1881 on page 27, line 28 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Committee 1 is the one that would guarantee to the community areas on the drug program the right to review any grants. And I move the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The Lady's moved the adoption of Amendment #1. to Senate Bill 1881. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Getty. Amends Senate Bill 1881 on page 1, line 4 by deleting '26' and so forth."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we can go to Amendment #3 because Mr. Getty's not here and then it call it again as well."

Speaker Redmond: "Take Amendment #3, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Geo-Karis. Amends Senate Bill 1881 on page 1, line 25 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Speaker, I'm going to object. This Bill was reported out of Committee just yesterday and there is not on our desk any of the Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "I've been advised that the floor Amendments have not been printed, so you're objection is well taken. We'll take this one out of the record and hold it. Now on motions,



does Representative Lundy seek recognition?"

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

Mr. Speaker, I have a written motion filed with the Clerk. I wonder if the Clerk could read the motion."

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion, to suspend Rule 55 and 56. That debate on all motions be limited to a three minute statement by the maker of the motion and a three minute statement by one appointment, opponent."

Speaker Redmond: "Discussion? Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this motion is made in the interest of attempting to expedite the conclusion of our business. It is in line with a practice which has been followed in the closing days of prior Sessions of the House. What it says essentially is that with regard to that order of business involving largely Bills that either have already been heard or Bills that for some reason or another did not come out of Committees in the normal process. Rather than bogging the House down in sometimes hours of debate whether, at this very late stage in the Session, we should further consider these Bills. We will limit the debate on those motions to one three minute statement by the maker of the motion and one three minute statement by an opponent who in the case of discharging a Committee or taking a Bill from the Speaker's Table that has been reported do not pass, will presumably be the Chairman of the Committee that considered the Bill and that that amount of time should be adequate to inform the Members of what is at issue and allow them to vote intelligently. Now, I would point out to the Members of the House that on these motions, it is not in order to debate the merits of the Bill and so we are not cutting off any debate on the merits of the Bill. The only thing that's in order to discuss when the motion is called is the reason for passing the motion. That is the reason to discharge Committee or to take the Bill from the Table; and therefore, it seems to me that three minutes by the maker of the motion and three minutes by an opponent is adequate and I would renew the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich, do you seek recognition?"



Friedrich: "No, sir. I thought he was speaking about Bills of this motion..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, it sounds like a good motion. I have one question for the Sponsor. Suppose that the Bill's never been to Committee, never been to any Committee and there's a motion to take from the Table, how would you suggest they select who's going to be the opponent or speak against it?"

Lundy: "I would leave that to the Speaker."

Deuster: "The Speaker, I see, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this motion covers two rules, 55 and 56. Yesterday, there was a motion made by Mr. Leinenweber that carried suspending that portion of rule 56 allowing Members the right to explain their votes and I would not... I would presume this motion or I would hope it would carry; but if this motion with regards to both rules does not carry, I presume that Mr. Leinenweber's motion and the action of this House suspending the right to explain votes on motions is still in force."

Speaker Redmond: "I would presume so unless the Body advises me to the contrary. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's with some disappointment that I stand up before you now and I think explanation of votes are a very useful tool and I think from my limited experience after two terms, the Calendar doesn't look that bad considering adjournment July 1. I've always found it very useful for people to explain their vote, not only for some of us to decide on how to vote, but also like last night for us to get some people here. I'd hesitate now with five days or six days to go in our Legislative Session to support such a motion and I respectfully go against this motion because I think explanation of votes is everybody's right and it's useful and it's... provides some knowledge for all us and I would ask you all to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Latijevich."



Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, although I agree with Representative McClain in the importance of explanation of votes, this motion which I joined Representative Lundy on is limited only to the motions on the Calendar. It's not limited to other readings and so I think in this case, it does serve a useful purpose to move the things along. We've been spending a lot of unnecessary time on motions and I think we'll all agree with that. And therefore, I would ask the Membership to join and vote in behalf of this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker, I think it's important on these big Bills that are coming back over, the Mental Health, the school Bills and where there's millions of dollars involved that we, as Members of this Body, have a right to express ourselves in discussion. And I would be opposed to limiting the discussion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The last comment seemed to misconstrue the motion. The motion to limit debate does not apply to concurrences. It applies only to motions to discharge Committee or to take from the Table."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? The question is on the Gentleman's motion to suspend rules. Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to clarify one point. It is, I think, evident from the debate and Representative Shea pointed out the motion as written, just checked with the Clerk, does extend also to eliminating explanation of vote on this very narrow category of motions, namely, those to take from the Table or discharge Committee. I would also point out it applies only to motion with respect to House Bills, not with respect to Senate Bills. So if there's a Senate Bill in Committee that for some reason didn't get heard or otherwise, this motion would not apply to that. It applies only to motions to discharge or take from the Table House Bills and... that's right. Motions on the Calendar and it would limit to the debate to a three minute statement by the maker of the motion, a three minute



statement by the... by an opponent and it would eliminate explanation of votes on those motions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, is the posture of the motion the same as it was a few minutes ago? Mr. Lundy hasn't amended the motion in his statement, has he?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, the same as it was."

Madigan: "The same as it was. I rise in support of Mr. Lundy's motion. My reason for supporting the motion..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Schlickman: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What's your point?"

Schlickman: "Mr. Lundy had closed."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, okay."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker..."

Madigan: "Well, I think we ought to abide by the rules."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Madigan: "Now and in the future, Mr. Speaker, later in the day."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. The question's on the Gentleman's motion to suspend Rules 55 and 56. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. I would like to comment that we have Saturday and Sunday intervening here, so don't be misled by how many Legislative Days you may have. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 91 'ayes' and 28 'nos' and the Gentleman's motion carries. Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Just to be certain that there isn't confusion later in the day, I would ask the Speaker whether 89 votes is sufficient to suspend these rules or whether we need 107."

Speaker Redmond: "89."

Lundy: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I think you declared that passed. Now, I wonder if it's in order, Mr. Speaker, since every Speaker that's



been on podium has ruled that any..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster, for what purpose do you rise?"

Deuster: "I didn't hear the announcement of the results."

Speaker Redmond: "I announced 91 and 28 and the motion carried."

Deuster: "All right, thank you."

Matijevich: "Now, Mr. Speaker, since everybody on the podium has ruled that any motion relative to discharging Rules Committee is out of order because it suspends a Joint Rule, I wonder if it would be in order that the Speaker, by order, rule all such motions on the Calendar as being out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "I'm not going to so rule until my Parliamentarian gets out of bed. Will you renew your request a little bit earlier."

Matijevich: "Well, I'd like to make that point of order and when you get to it, rule on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, we'll rule on it at the appropriate time. Senate Bills, Third Reading. Well, no. On the order of Non-concurrence, there's Senate Bill 1514. Representative Totten, for what purpose do you rise?"

Totten: "Inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. We've had a Conference Committee scheduled at 9:30 down in 122A. We were just down there and nobody is down there and, you know, I wonder if Representative Bradley, who's apparently in charge of Conference Committees, could inform our side of the aisle as to what will be going on."

Speaker Redmond: "He was there a minute ago. Representative Bradley, fore and aft. I'm afraid that Representative Bradley got some bad habits in the last Session. Here's Representative Bradley, will you confer with Representative Totten. The order is Non-concurrence. 1514. Representative Kosinski. Giorgi, are you on 1514? How do you spell the name?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, just to enlighten the Conference Committee Report, I thought maybe Totten would call Speaker Blair up and have him give us his method of operation for previous Conference Committees."



Speaker Redmond: "Speaker Blair left those instructions in the back room. Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I would like the opportunity to remind several Members of the House that the Conference Committee on Senate Bill 1620 is scheduled to meet now in Room 122A."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski on Senate Bill 1514."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I think Fred is the Sponsor of this Bill. That was an error in..."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Kosinski: "Fred Schraeder."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we do not concur with House Bill 1514 and a Conference Committee be appointed to 1514. And, Mr. Speaker, I've asked that Representative Kosinski's name be removed. We've been having a running battle on who's going to handle this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, I'd remove it."

Schraeder: "It's a friendly battle."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, what... have you moved to nonconcur, that's the point? Representative Schraeder has refused to recede from House Amendment #1. Those in... Representative Schraeder or Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Has... would the Sponsor yield please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will, he'll yield."

Schlickman: "I have the answer. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' carries... the motion carries and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1. 1609. Representative J.D. Jones. 1609 on Nonconcurrency. Representative J.D. Jones."

J.D. Jones: "I move that we do not accept the Nonconcurrency and a Conference Committee be appointed to resolve the matter."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1609. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it."



The motion carries and the Conference Committee is requested. 1934, Representative Terzich. Terzich, 1934. Nonconcurrency, 1934."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House nonconcur and request a Conference Committee be formed on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10 to Senate Bill 1934. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. The House refuses to recede. A request for a Conference Committee is made. On the order of Concurrence, 2736, Representative Katz. Out of the record. 3147, G.L. Hoffman or Schnedier. Out of the record. 3308, Representative Leverenz, Lechowicz rather. 3308, Representative Lechowicz. Out of the record. 3411, Representative VanDuyne. Out of the record. 3505, Representative Birchler. Birchler.i

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we concur with the Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3505."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3505. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action, 89 votes. Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Speaker, I wish the Gentleman would explain what those Amendments do."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Yes, I can explain. Number one, Amendment #1 stated that the... no, Amendment #2, that farmers do not have to register and #1 was that persons that raised hens and have the eggs at the farm do not have to candle 'em. That was the two Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 98 'aye' and no 'nays' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3505. 3605. Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3605 merely moves the reporting date for the Aggregate Problems Commission to a couple of months



earlier to allow legislation to be put in next year if it so desires. I would move that we concur in the Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3605. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 89 votes, final action. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'aye' and no 'nay' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3605. 3630, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm handling this Bill for Representative VonBoeckman and the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3630 on line 8, page 4 where the term 'public purposes' is used, the Senate Amendment defines the public purposes by placing the words 'park recreational or open space purposes'. So, I therefore, move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3630."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3630. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action; 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, 126 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3630. 3817, Representative Lechowicz? Out of the Record. 3838, Representative Chapman. Who are you pointing to?"

Chapman: "Representative Lundy."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 3838. Amendment #1--and these, by the way, are all agreeable to Representative Chapman, the Chairman of the Human Resources' Committee; and this is a Committee Bill, and they're all basically friendly Amendments consistent with the original purposes of the Bill; the original Bill was the financial disclosure requirements for long-term care facilities-- Amendment #1, added by Senator Don Moore, Chairman of the, let's see, the Advisory Commission on Public Aid, would make clear that the financial data reported would be available to the Legislative Advisory Commission for its investigation. Amendment #2 would require that a joint set of regulations governing the financial statements be issued by the Department of Public Aid and the Department of Public Health. This is in order to guarantee, in line with the original intent of the Bill, that there is no duplication of forms or duplication of burden on the licensees; and Senate Amendment #2 would add an immediate effective date to the Bill. I renew my motion that the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, it appears that Amendment #2 is technically deficient in that lines 4, 5, 6 and 7 are not underscored; and I would ask for the leave of the House to have the Clerk do the necessary underscoring on its face."



Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, he says that it appears that Amendment 2 is . . . may be defective and that certain things are not underscored and he . . . leave of the House for you to do it manually. Are there any objections? Leave of the House granted. Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I . . . Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House . . . I am grateful for Representative Schlickman for bringing this to my attention, which I had noticed before. My question is, if this Amendment that has been distributed to us is the same Amendment as was adopted by the Senate; and it was adopted by the Senate in improper form. I wonder, simply correcting the Amendment on its face will do the job or whether we don't have to nonconcur and go to a Conference Committee on it?"

Speaker Redmond: "We are of the opinion that Enrolling and Engrossing can do it with the action we've taken here and that it will not be faulty."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then I would . . . then I would concur in Senate . . . Representative Schlickman's request that we simply amend Amendment #2 on its face to underscore the language in quotes."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the House to concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3. Those in favor of the motion indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I wanted to ask the Sponsor a question; but I don't know if it's . . . if you've precluded that now or not."

Speaker Redmond: "Go ahead."

Friedrich: "Representative Lundy, these are the things that bother me; we send the Bill over there and then it comes back and explains the Amendment. But I think what we need to know--this is final action--what . . . we need to know what the Bill does as amended. That's what I need to know."

Lundy: "The Bill as amended does substantially what it did when it passed out of this House, and that is to require licensed, long-term



care facilities in this state to file an annual financial statement with the Department of Public Health, and to guarantee those licensees that there will be no duplication of reporting requirements because it prohibits any other state agency from imposing similar requirements."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 110 'aye' and . . . 112 'aye' and 14 'no'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 3838. 3843. Representative Yourell 'aye' on that last one. Representative Laurino on the floor? 3850, Representative Schneider? 3858, Representative Schisler? Representative Chapman. Representative Chapman. Will you turn . . ."

(con't on next page)



Chapman: "In regards to House Bill 3850 which you just called, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me, 3850. Chapman for Schneider."

Chapman: "I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3850. Senate Amendment #1 in no way hurts the Bill as it was approved by the Illinois House. It relates to the powers for school boards. It was offered by Senator Schaffer because of the problem raised in his district. At the present time, school boards may purchase property in order that their vocational training classes may build a home or some structure which has been sold. This gives students experience in trades that they otherwise could only learn in a theoretical way. This property then is required to be sold and this action only can occur as a result of a vote of two-thirds of the board members. Because of a problem in finding enough money to buy this property to build the building which then will be sold, the additional power given to the school boards is to borrow the funds for the purchase of this one piece of real estate which then is resold. And this was approved in the Senate by a vote of 53 to nothing and I would ask for your concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman."

Berman: "Will the Sponsor yield? In the Amendment, it just says it's a one... sort of a one word addition, isn't it that allows them to borrow money?"

Chapman: "Is my mike on? Yeah, it says or to borrow funds. I went into the lengthier discussion because I was concerned that somebody might think that one could just borrow funds for the purchase of real estate which is what a cursory view of the Amendment might lead a person to believe. But actually this is as you point out, relates only to one piece of real estate which is not to be used for a schoolhouse or for permanent use; but is only to be purchased in order to provide this training experience for students and then must be resold within a five year period."

Berman: "Well, I understand that. My question is how can a school board borrow the funds? There's no provisions in this Amendment



to cover that. Are we talking about issuance of a bond or are we talking about pledging of security for mortgages? There is no statutory set-up here for them to borrow. It's... they're not a private individual that can borrow money and... with collateral. There has to be certain statutory provisions. How would they be able to borrow it?"

Chapman: "There are other provisions in the School Code, there's 10-22.14 that relates to borrowing money and 10-22.35A which relates to the purchase of sites. But you're right, the only words which are added is, 'as is, or to borrow funds for the purchase of real estate'. And the added words are, 'or to borrow funds'."

Berman: "Well, if I may address..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Berman: "... the motion. I've been advised that the intent of the Amendment is not carried out in a proper way and I... it has been brought to my attention that just adding the words, the power to borrow, is not sufficient to give these school districts the authority to, in fact, legally borrow money for the purpose that we're talking about. I remember last year when this subject was addressed in another Bill. Many of us recognized the need to allow these test homes to be built for purposes of vocational education. Now, we're expanding it further and I think improperly expanding it with just adding the words, to borrow money, in order to purchase these test homes. Secondly, I would point out that this Senate Amendment has nothing to do with the original purpose of the Bill and I think that that's a bad precedent to follow. I would rather see that we vote against this Concurrence motion and the original purpose of the Bill be followed through with and next year, take a look at the need to properly address ourselves to the question of whether we have to borrow money for vocational training, homes that the children, that the students want to work on. I don't think this is the right approach. I think it's haphazard. It's not relevant to the original subject of the Bill which I supported and I still support. And I would vote... I'm going to



vote against the Concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to move to nonconcur on the basis of what Representative Berman says. This... as he points out, the Amendment does not relate to the original purpose of the Bill. However, it unquestionably is germane because it does relate to... powers."

Speaker Redmond: "What is your pleasure? Do you want to nonconcur?"

Chapman: "Yes, this is Senator's Schaffer's Amendment and perhaps this is something that he and Representative Berman could work out in a Conference Committee. I move to nonconcur."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. The Lady has moved that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3850. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3850. Nonconcur. Representative Laurino. Representative Schneider, 3147. Are you ready on that one? Out of the record. Representative Lechowicz here? Representative Leon, for what purpose do you rise?"

Leon: "Mr. Speaker, a Conference Committee on House Bill 3115 and 3116 is going to be held immediately at 10 a.m. in Senator McCarthy's Office. Would the Members of that Conference Committee please join me in going there to conduct our business?"

Speaker Redmond: "Conference Committee Reports. On Conference Committee Reports, appears House Bill 3068. Representative Chapman. 3068."

Chapman: "Would you recognize Representative Downs, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Downs."

Downs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Bill came back..."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Lundy, for what purpose do you rise?"

Lundy: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Lundy: "I apologize for interrupting the Gentleman from Oak Park, but I don't believe a copy of the Conference Committee Report has been distributed."



JUN 24 1976

25.

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Page, we'll take it out of the record then. Will you see Representative Lundy? The Page's records indicate it has been distributed, Representative Lundy. This morning. I guess we'd better take it out temporarily then. Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if it has been distributed and I've just failed to get a copy, I would withdraw my objection."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, it appears that the only Conference Committee Report that has been distributed is on Senate Bill 31."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, we'll take it out of the record for a while. And be sure that Conference Committee Report is distributed, Mr. Page. On Conference Committee Reports, Senate Bill 31. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a unanimous Conference Committee Report. It is the legislative pay... payments report. It's simply in its amended form, provides for monthly pay. It provides that if you work during the month, you get the month's pay. It provides that the spouse as the law now covers it would receive the pay in the event of death. It brings this Bill into conformity to the House Executive Committee Bill and I would urge the adoption of the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ebbesen: "Representative Katz, just one question here. On the Conference Committee Report, it says that a Member who has held office any part of a month is entitled to compensation for an entire month. Now, my question is, let's say that at the completion of 1976, Members who are leaving office in 1977, will serve part of a month. In no way will they receive compensation for that month, is that correct?"

Katz: "That is correct. The maximum that any Legislator can receive is the \$20,000 and that would be 12 monthly payments. So, there's



no way that you could get more than the amount that is provided of \$20,000."

Ebbesen: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question, please? Mr. Sponsor, I believe the Amendment that was put on in the Senate was the one where the pay was supposed to be accrued and the collected at the end of each month starting January 1, 1977. Is that what the Amendment was?"

Katz: "Well, the Senate Amendment that the House did not concur in was abandoned in the Conference Committee."

Geo-Karis: "I see."

Katz: "The Conference Committee came out with a report that did not incorporate the language in the Senate that resulted in the House nonconcurring."

Geo-Karis: "I see, so in other words, it's just straight 12 monthly payments."

Katz: "That's correct, Ms. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Okay, thank you."

Katz: "Thank you, Ms. Geo-Karis."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Sponsor yield to one question?"

I don't have a copy of the Committee Report either, but I'm wondering if you would expand just a bit on the surviving spouse. Do I understand you to say that if a Member is elected and maybe dies within two months, that his spouse would receive the full \$20,000 or \$40,000 as the case may be?"

Katz: "Yes, it does not change the existing law. It simply leaves the law as it now is."

Brinkmeier: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion. Representative Madison."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Madison: "Representative Katz, as it relates to the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 31, now in substantially the form



it's in now, how does this Bill differ from Representative Lundy's Bill which, by the way, is now on the Governor's desk?"

Katz: "I believe that it is the same. Senator Hall's Bill is now in the same shape that the House Bill was."

Madison: "That being the facts, Representative Katz, is there any reason why we should bother the Governor with Senate Bill 31?"

Katz: "Well, it has been the practice here, Representative Madison, that where a Sponsor in the other House has dilligently pursued a legislative topic, that his Bill also goes to the Governor. Senator Hall has been at this subject for a number of years and it would be unfair to him not to accord to him the same courtesy that the Senate accorded to the House Sponsors."

Madison: "What would be the technical effect of the Governor signing both these Bills?"

Katz: "Well, I would guess that the Governor would..."

Madison: "Wouldn't he be paid \$40,000 a year?"

Katz: "No, I'm afraid not. But the technical effect would be that Representative Matijevich on the House Bill, I'm sure, would be well recognized by his constituents there and it may also be that a Senator who worked very hard might get some credit from his constituents and we are all in the process of serving our constituency. No harm would be occasioned by passing this. It would be in accordance with our traditions, but it would not result in doubling our salary."

Madison: "Well, that's unfortunate, Representative Katz. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 31. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. All voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye' and 2 'no' and the House does adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 31. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise for the purpose of an announcement concerning our Conference Committees. It's been agreed that we would move the Conference Committees from Room 122 for the meetings and we were going to set a table up in the east corridor



right next to the floor of the House so the Members will not, those Members on the Committees will not be off of the House for a very long time. So, we'll be meeting on the east corridor at the same time as originally scheduled. Now, I would like to announce on House Bill 3392 that was set for a Conference Committee and 12:30 today, that House Bill 3392 at the request of the Senate will be delayed for 24 hours and was rescheduled for 12:30 tomorrow, so I hope all the Members are listening now. All the Conference Committees will be held in the east corridor, starting at 11 o'clock this morning. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "On the order of Concurrence appears House Bill 3817, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3... Oh, I'm sorry. Let me reiterate this."

Speaker Redmond: "You want 3308?"

Lechowicz: "Yeah, 3308."

Speaker Redmond: "3308."

Lechowicz: "What Senate Amendment #1 did to House Bill 3308, it provides new language as far as a notice of procedure. The notice of the State's Attorney's motion for postponement be made to the minor's attorney, parent, or guardian. That the notice be given in compliance with the provisions of the original notice, leaving notice with the person summoned by at least three days before their required appearance, leaving notice with some person of the family and mailing a copy of the summons at least three days before the required appearance which goes with Chapter 37, paragraph 704-3. A notice be given by certified mail or publication if the party is not a resident of this state. And this really is in total conformity with the Juvenile Court Act Notice Provision and I move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3308."

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

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"



Lechowicz: "Surely."

Schlickman: "The Senate Amendment deals only with the matter of notice and not the amount of extension of time?"

Lechowicz: "Strictly in the notice."

Schlickman: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3308. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 89 votes, final action. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 129 'aye' and 4 'no' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3308. 3817, Representative Lechowicz, do you want that one? Out of the record. Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1547, Representative Kozubowski. Out of the record. 1600, Representative Schraeder. Out of the record. 1603, Kozubowski. 1610, Representative Merlo. Representative Merlo on the floor? Out of the record. 1614."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1614. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Law Enforcement. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers. What's your point, Representative Geo-Karis?"

Geo-Karis: "I withdraw my point of order. I was looking at the wrong Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Incredible. Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This budget was well discussed yesterday and Amendments adopted. This is for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Law Enforcement and I would move for its passage."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. 1622. On this question, 152 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 1622."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1622. A Bill for an Act to provide for



the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Aging.
Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill was heard in the Appropriations
II Committee. There were no Amendments at that... on this par-
ticular Bill. It calls for \$18,000,000. Of that amount,
\$15,000,000 is federal monies. This is the Aging Bill and I
so move that we get a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in
favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished?
Clerk will take the record. On this question there 's 137, 140
'aye' and no 'nay'; and the Bill having received the Constitu-
tional majority is hereby declared passed. 1625."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1625. A Bill for an Act making an
appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the
Department of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this
Bill was well discussed yesterday. Committee Amendments were
adopted and I ask for the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in
favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished?
Clerk will take the record. On this question, 141 'aye' and 1
'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional majority
is hereby declared passed. 1627, J.M. Houlihan."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1627. A Bill for an Act to provide
for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of
Registration and Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass. Represen-
tative Maragos, for what purpose do you rise?"

Maragos: "I think it is incumbent upon the Sponsor of these Bills
to just let us know what... how much money we're voting for
every morning."

Speaker Redmond: "They advised me that they discussed that at Second
Reading. Representative Houlihan."

J.M. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,



in spite of Representative Hill's counsel, I will respond to Representative Maragos's question. Senate Bill 1627 is the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Registration and Education. There was a thorough discussion of this Bill on Second Reading. A number of Amendments were adopted and Sam, I'm looking for the total figure right now which I will give to you. Representative Maragos give up and I will ask for a favorable..."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye' and 1 'no'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 1650. Representative Stone."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1650. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Community College Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stone in the chamber? Take this out of the record. 1742, Representative Mudd."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1742. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the permanent improvements and related grants-Capital Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would simply move to... ask passage of this Bill. I think it's been debated and it's in the shape that the House wants it in."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question 145 'aye' and 5 'no'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 1863. Out of the request of the Sponsor. 1935, Representative Hanahan. 1939, out of the record? 1935 out of the record. 1938, Representative Stone. Out of the record. 1939, Representative Hanahan."

Clerk O'Brien; "Senate Bill 1939. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the University Civil Service Merit Board. Third Reading of the Bill."



Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1939 appropriates \$445,800 to the ordinary and contingent expenses. It has the Amendment that only 50% can be utilized in the first six months of the... for personal services, travel and telecommunications for this six month period of the appropriation period. If there's any questions, I'll answer 'em. Otherwise, I move for the adoption of Senate Bill 1939."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'aye' and 4 'no'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 1941, Representative Brandt."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1941. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Legislative Space Needs Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Brandt: "Mr. Chairman, Members of the Assembly, Senate Bill 1941 appropriates \$99,700 to the Legislative Space Needs Commission for the ordinary and contingent expenses and also for \$28,000 for equipment and furniture for the Senate Office Building, offices, rather, in the first floor that will be completed by February 1st of 1977. And also it appropriates \$16,600,000 for the Capital Development Fund, and also reappropriates \$2,400,000 for land acquisition. I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any questions? The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'aye' and 1 'no'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 1962."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1962. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for a new State Office Building in Springfield. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brandt."

Brandt: "Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission... Members of the



House, 1962 is the appropriation of \$12,000,000. Originally, it was for \$49,000,000. It was reduced to \$12,000,000 for the purpose of a... getting the plans and the engineering work for the purpose of the construction of a new office building. I'd appreciate an affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just very briefly, I hope that some of the Members of the House will look at this Bill. I know that this is sort of a plum to some of the local Sangamon County Legislators and it might even prove to be more convenient for us. But it seems inconceivable to me that we will go ahead and appropriate \$12,000,000 for a new State Office Building when we can't appropriately finance the schools of this state, to say nothing of numerous departments of this state. I think now is no time to be talking about building new buildings to make a fat government even fatter when we need the funds for other things. And I hope a few of us, at least, will vote 'no' on this preposterous project."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is... Representative Washington."

Washington. Are you flashing, Representative Washington? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, I couldn't disagree more with the previous speaker, but I would like to ask a question of the Sponsor if I might. Will the Sponsor of the Bill yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Skinner: "Representative Brandt, we are now renting space for the Office of Education in a building which I'm told is fairly inexpensive type to construct. I wonder if we are planning to build a similar building for the state or whether we will go more of the monument route such as the State Office Building's construction mode."

Brandt: "We are contemplating keeping in line with the office building that we have at the present time. In that structure."

Skinner: "Okay, well, I guess we're going to lose on that front; but nevertheless, I think the Members of the General Assembly before they jump to join the Representative from Lake in voting



against this Bill should know that we are renting three to four times the amount of space in the City of Springfield that, than this building will provide. Unfortunately, an article that was written by Susan Sax in the Springfield Register, Journal-Register appeared on a Sunday or a Friday. It was after we were out of Session and I happened to be here and I clipped it out and it is just an incredible amount of space we're renting and money we are spending and it's going to three or four or five owners of buildings or combinations of owners of buildings. Now, that's not necessarily bad; but it seems to me it's probably cheaper for us to own the building in the long run and I would certainly encourage support of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to second the suggestions of the Gentleman from Lake County and ask for a 'no' vote on this Bill. Now, Representative who spoke previously indicated that we're renting a great deal of space. Well, I will make you a bet that if we build this building and it's to be a monument as pointed out by the previous speaker, that the amount of rental space will not significantly decrease, but the amount of public employees will greatly increase in order to fill all available space. The talk has been trying to cut down on bureaucracy, trying to hold the line on state payrollers and the best way to prevent that from happening is to build office spaces. So, I certainly concur that this ought to be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it was a happy day for the taxpayers of the 54th District when the intelligent people from Lake County sent Representative Griesheimer down here. He couldn't be righter about this matter. There's no law against non sequitur in arguments, so I guess the Gentleman from McHenry's entitled to say that because you're renting space you have to build a house. That doesn't follow logically. You terminate the leases, you cut off the money. My constituents didn't send me... quit laughing... my constituents didn't send me down here to continue the madness of polluting



the Sangamon County economy with money and great jobs beyond their capacity to absorb. It's time to stop that. It's time to look at it a little and reexamine the concept of regional offices throughout the length and breadth of the State of Illinois. There's no law that says that all of the state facilities has to be in Sangamon County and the law of common sense and the interest of your constituents dictates quite the contrary. Be proud to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, rise in opposition to this Bill. I remember a year or so ago I opposed the same concept. Somebody once said, it's difficult for an empty sack to stand upright and I think the sack is the financial sack and the State of Illinois is becoming empty. It does not stand upright and I also feel that the arguments in favor of expenditures of vast amounts of money at this time when we can ill afford it, also represent an empty sack of arguments that fails to stand upright. And I am urging a 'no' vote. I'm going to say this, too. That it seems to me that if we continue to present these arguments, spend money under the banner of economy, that in the... if we continue to put into effect these economy measures, this state is going to go broke long in advance of the time we might logically expect it to do so. I urge a 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Friedrich: "Representative Brandt, does this include the parking garage?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brandt."

Brandt: "This does not include the parking garage. This is for the purpose of getting the plans and the engineering work for the preparation of the building of a new state building which is needed at... which is needed because the state at the present time is spending over \$6,000,000 a year rent for space that they have to rent outside of the Capital Complex."



Friedrich: "Where is the appropriation for the parking garage?"

Brandt: "The appropriation has been taxed. There was a bond issue of \$10,000,000 for the parking lot."

Friedrich: "All right, Mr. Speaker, I guess my remarks are not timely, but whether you realize it or not across the street, we're about to build a 700-car underground parking garage at an estimated cost at this point of \$9,800 a car. My prediction is it'll be \$15,000 a car before we get done and that's just for building it. That doesn't have anything to do with maintaining it. We have about as much use for a 700-car underground parking garage as we do for another hole in our head. It's wrong; it's a waste of the taxpayer's money and I was the one who opposed it in Space Needs Committee. I do not object to building the state building."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't want Representative Cunningham to think that all of Lake County agrees with my colleague because I remember way back when Bill Stratton was the Governor, one of the most controversial issues at the time was the building of the State Office Building and I wonder where'd we be now if we didn't have that State Office Building. When somebody ten years from now looks back and thinks of the narrow-minded people who, for some emotional, political reasons, said we shouldn't build a State Office Building. I think they're going to say, thank God, there were those who stood up because we do have that need. Look at all the money we're spending in rent. We need a State Office Building. We need it here in Springfield, so I would urge the Membership to vote 'aye' on this urgent need that we have."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

Ralph Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ralph Dunn: "Representative Brandt, how much is this for? I didn't quite... how much money is this appropriation for?"

Brandt: "\$12,000,000."



Ralph Dunn: "And that's just for planning and designs, not for acquisition of property or anything?"

Brandt: "No, it's for planning and the pedestrian... it's for the pedestrian plan including the grading and electrical systems in the Capital Complex, relocation of underground utility tunnels from Spring and rerouting it to First Street, demolition of the existing structures of the Odd Fellows and the Waterways Building, the architects and engineers fees and the fees for the construction management and the efficable, reimbursable styling and design which totaled up to about \$12,000,000."

Ralph Dunn: "Excuse me, what will be the total cost of the building after they spend \$12,000,000 for design?"

Brandt: "Well, we were asking for the original appropriation which was for \$49,000,000. However, we could not use that \$49,000,000; so therefore, we deleted that amount to \$12,000,000 because we need... we have to go out and get all the preparation of the planning and the engineering work so that we will not be able to do any construction on the building until 1980. So therefore, we have to get all this planning way before hand."

Ralph Dunn: "And all the money you request is from general revenue, is that correct?"

Brandt: "No, it's not. It's from a bond issue."

Ralph Dunn: "Thank you."

Brandt: "Capital Bond issue."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

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

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

All those... the question is shall the main question be put.

All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

Representative Brandt, to close."

Brandt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly, as I stated before that we here in the state are paying over \$6,000,000 a year rent. Now if this was several years ago when this proposition was put forth to the Members of this august Body, however, they did not feel as though it was necessary at that time. However, since that time, it's cost the state and the taxpayers a lot of money in



rent and I feel when we put this building up for this capital building, state building, I think that we will be saving the taxpayers quite a bit of money and I'd appreciate a favorable vote on this particular Senate Bill."

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

J.D. Jones: "I intended to speak to the Bill, but if I can do this in explaining my vote, I'm going to echo what Representative Brandt said because, you know, the Legislature almost ten years ago decided there was to be a new office building on the two blocks north of the State Capitol and it has not been developed in that time, but now in concurrence with the administration and with the Space Needs Commission which is the Legislative Body which has control and decision-making over... on such matters, has had a long and lengthy discussions and meetings and this would be the best way to go to accomplish the needs of the state and its offices. And as Representative Brandt just said, the state is now paying \$6,000,000 a year in rent and this applying against the cost of this development would be a good investment and I appreciate your vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues of the House. I certainly would not have the temerity to suggest or dictate the conscience of the House. I have enough trouble with my own conscience on particular Bills; but it is early in the day and we are approaching the end of the Session and I can't help but mention once again something that has been repeatedly stated on the floor of this House. The merits or demerits of a Bill are certainly proper within the province of our arguments. Representative Hudson is a classic example of what I would refer and this is one of the few times I've mentioned a Gentleman's name in debate. In all the years that I've been in the Legislature with Representative Hudson, I cannot recall of one single instance where he has demeaned an opponent of a Bill that he has been fighting. In this particular case, we again will differ



as to what should or should not be done; but the fact is he stuck to the Bill and I think that his practice is one we can all benefit from. If we could avoid the personalities that occasionally creep into the debate, it would make this a much pleasanter House for all of us and I can't help but commend Hudson and those like him who stuck to the merits of the Bill without making some of us feel ashamed about how we vote for or against a Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative Epton. I didn't intend to get in this debate until the reference was made to Sangamon County Legislators. This was not proposed by Sangamon County Legislators. It was proposed, as J. David Jones said, by the Space Needs Commission which is a large Commission of the Senate and the House and I think it was almost unanimous, their approval. This project has been worked on for many, many, many years. The Capital Development Board as well as the Space Needs as well as the Governor and everyone concerned with this stands behind this proposal. What occurred was during the Ogilvie administration, they decided not to go ahead with the buildings program and rather to lease. We have seen now that we are leasing \$6,000,000 and this is not the proper approach. So, the Space Needs Commission and the Capital Development Board decided rightly so to build this new building and we appreciate your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112 'aye' and 37 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 1970. Representative Lechowicz."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1970. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Law Enforcement. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1970 is a transfer appropriation for the



Department of Law Enforcement in their fiscal '76 appropriation. The Bill transfers \$70,000 out of the State Police Services, Personal Services into the apprehension of fugitives line item. These funds are used to compensate local law enforcement authorities for returning extradited felons to the State of Illinois and I would strongly encourage an 'aye' vote. If there's any questions, I'll be more than happy to answer 'em."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 149 'aye' and 2 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Berman 'aye'. 1603."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1603. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Personnel. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1603 is the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Personnel in the amount of \$76,600,000. This is a \$10,000,000 increase over last year and I would move for the approval of House... Senate Bill 1603."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is shall this Bill pass. All those in favor, vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. Representative Dunn 'aye'. 1863. 1863."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1863. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Capital Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill gives appropriation to the Capital Development Board of \$7,000,000 regarding a cargo containerization facilities for the Chicago Regional Port District. This is a program that has been established over three years ago and this is passed by the approval of the Economic and Fiscal Commission of the state of the... the stateless General Assembly as bipartisan in effect and I ask



for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Well, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mulcahey: "Representative Maragos, how many acres of land are needed for this cargo handling facility?"

Maragos: "194 million... 194 acres, but it also includes the purchase of the improvements and also the establishment of the container facility."

Mulcahey: "You say it does need 149 acres?"

Maragos: "No, it's 194 acres. It's the total acreage we wanted to get under the jurisdiction of the port which will... for expansion purposes. If we can take it as one package, there'll be... much cheaper in the long run."

Mulcahey: "Well, all right. But actually, why are you going to buy more acres than you really need? Is it not true that you really only need about 47 acres?"

Maragos: "We have to buy the whole area because it's a one owner, it's going to cost us more if we take it piece by piece; and the development of this whole area of this 194 acres along the lake and along the river will make it more feasible to buy it as one package than if we have to go and buy it in piecemeal basis."

Mulcahey: "What is the projected price per acre?"

Maragos: "Right now, if you divide, it's about \$4,000,000 for the cost of the land and improvements that are presently on, about \$3,000,000 will be for the cost of the containerizing facility."

Mulcahey: "All right, I believe it was originally \$26,800 per acre for 114 acres, so our \$3,000,000 at the original price and is it not true now that Trans-Oceanic wants \$11 and 1/2 million for all 195 acres?"

Maragos: "Sure, if you're going to... that's we had to table it. We offered another Bill that's going to give it condemnation power so we cannot be held out again. We tried to negotiate before, but they want more money than the \$11,000,000, so that's why we... by condemnation, we'll have a regular court procedure by which the true price will be determined by fair market value rather than



have it sold to us by negotiation."

Mulcahey: "Is there any active appropriation for the Chicago Regional Port District?"

Maragos: "Is there any what?"

Mulcahey: "Active appropriation for the Chicago Regional Port District?"

Maragos: "No, there's been no... this district has always been on a self-contained basis. There's been no subsidy for it and I'd just state further that the money... on the present Act which has been adopted two years ago, the district will be paying back the State of Illinois on the same basis that we discussed the other day for all port districts as they... alone."

Mulcahey: "All right, I'd like to speak to the Bill if I may, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Mulcahey: "The way I see it right now, the only valuable part of the land that we're talking about purchasing right now is the land that is bordering the riverfront. Youngstown Steel, it's my understanding, wants to sell it all because the land is no good. And so I question as to why we as the taxpayers of the State of Illinois have to pick up another 150 acres. 47 acres in my estimation is all that is needed. It's going to cost the state extra money. We also know that the Capital Development Board never did release some \$3,000,000 appropriation because the port districts never furnished a precise program statement on what they plan to do, where they plan on doing it, or how much it's going to cost. \$10,000,000 is not going to be enough money for land purchase; it's not going to be enough money to complete the cargo handling facility and I would say the estimate is going to be between 15 and 18 million dollars. So what is going to happen in the final analysis is we're going to be back in for another supplemental appropriation for anywhere from 12 to 15 million dollars in the future. I urge a 'no' vote on this very Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

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



I rise in support of Senate Bill 1863. A concept which has already been approved by this House when we acted upon the House Bill also sponsored by Representative Maragos. This is a subject that is not new to this House. We have passed a similar appropriation in the previous Session. Unfortunately, the money that was not released which was alluded to by the previous Gentleman, was not because of absence of planning. There was adequate planning, but the Governor just saw fit to veto the Bill at that time and so the \$3,000,000 obviously could not be released because the additional money was not there. Reference has been made to the total acreage in the property. This property is not useless as has been suggested and anyone that would go out there and visit the area would see that this is prime property between the lakefront and Calumet Park on the south-east side on the lake. The letter acreage that has been referred for the containerized facility, it is true. This is the most important feature of this plan, but the acreage behind it is also needed and it's very valuable land which can be used for additional warehousing space which could be ideally suited to the foreign trade zone for which we have now qualified and a myriad of plans and purposes that could be applied to this area. This is valuable land, the waterfront acreage obviously is the most valuable but the whole area is important to the port of Chicago and the development of the lakefront in Chicago. This area will continue to thrive and once we do implement the containerized facilities at the mouth of the lake, don't forget that the entire port district stretches up the Calumet River and into Lake Calumet where we will continue to ship grain out of the huge elevators there and maintain our position as the largest agricultural exporting state in the Union. One hand washes the other. We will have our grain exports coming out of Lake Calumet, we'll have our containerized facilities at the mouth of the river. This Bill is vital, vital not only to the area which we represent; but vital to the economy of the State of Illinois. This will create jobs, this will bring income into the state, this is one of the more important Bills that you will be asked to act upon in this



Session. I can't overemphasize the importance that I place and I think all of us should place upon this legislation. And I implore every Member of this House to support this Bill. You're not voting for an area, you're voting for the economy of the State of Illinois. You're voting for your own constituents and every citizen of this state. Again, let me state I think this is one of the most important pieces of legislation that you will be asked to act upon. Please vote favorably."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a question? Sam, is there anything in this Bill that provides for the acquisition of any submerged land near or around U.S. Steel?"

Maragos: "No."

Yourell: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Just a minute, Representative Schlickman had his..."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1863 appropriates \$7,000,000 from the Capital Development Bond Fund to provide containerized cargo handling facilities, buildings and land for the Chicago Regional Port District. This appropriation, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in effect, is an interest free loan to the district to be paid back not at the rate of 50%, but at the rate of 20% which we approved earlier this week. The state would pay the \$5.1 million in debt service on these bonds that will have to be sold to make the loan. Now as the Gentleman from Winnebago commented earlier, there is an issue with respect to the price of the 195 acre plot. And listen to this, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, an appraisal last year found the land worth \$27,000 per acre. That's \$5,265,000. The private owner wants \$11.5 million or \$59,000 per acre for the land and the district has spoken in terms of \$8,000,000, almost \$3,000,000 more than the appraisal of last year. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill is a part of a package providing more powers to the district and giving to the Mayor of the City of Chicago control. I think it's a financially, fiscally irresponsible



matter and I would hope and ask the House to beat, to defeat, vote 'no' on Senate Bill 1863."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mann: "Representative Maragos, will this facility involve the taking of any existing park land?"

Maragos: "No."

Mann: "Will it involve the taking of any existing open space?"

Maragos: "No, because if you consider the present mill area which this whole area has... it's been zoned for manufacturing for at least 80 years since the original plant, this was a manufacturing district."

Mann: "One more question. Will the activities, the commercial activities planned here involve the pollution to the adjoining waterway or air pollution, in your judgement?"

Maragos: "No, because this will not be manufactured. This will be primarily warehousing and stevedoring."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio, now."

Giglio: "I move the previous question."

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

The question is shall the main question be put. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Maragos, to close."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in short, I would like to state that we agree that the private owner wants the \$59,000 an acre. We want to give him \$27,000 an acre, half the price because we have condemnation powers now which we are instilling. Secondly, we have... it's a good business practice to pay back the money. We're not borrowing it like other port districts, we are not keeping it as a subsidy, we're not using tax money. We are paying back, so that eventually the State of Illinois will benefit twofold. Beside the economic increase in business and taxes that we'll get out of this area, it'll also mean that they'll get the money back on 20% basis. Therefore, we ask for the... a 'yea' vote on this very important subject to the economy of the



State of Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Palmer, to explain his vote. Representative LaFleur, to explain his vote."

LaFleur: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I was sorry I could not speak on this because I think everyone should be aware that this is another case where we've given the port district of the City of Chicago, then they turn right around and come back with a bucket in each hand, asking for money from the state to support them. I think this is an ill-conceived Bill. I do not think the research is in it that would show that they have any idea of how much this is going to cost the state, how they're going to pay it back. If you look at the short shipping on the Great Lakes, the small ships that can use the St. Lawrence Seaway, the competition of the 'intermoter' shipment from the east coast, the midwest market that... and their competition with other ports on the Great Lakes, there's absolutely no way that the... Chicago can meet their obligations of repaying this money. I would think everyone would take a hard look at this Bill. It's another case of a bucket in each hand, take the money from Springfield, take it back to the City of Chicago and use for nothing else but the ill-conceived ideas that they have for their own area. I would urge everyone to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 105 'aye' and 40 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. The order of Concurrence appears House Bill 3817. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "I believe we're on Concurrences."

Speaker Redmond: "We are. The order of Concurrence, 3817, House Bill."

Lechowicz: "Read the Bill, Fred."

Clerk Selcke: "We don't read it on Concurrences, you move to concur with the Senate Amendments."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 on House Bill 3817. And permit me, if I may, to explain the Amendments



to the Members. Senate Amendment #1 provides that 50% of the appropriation in Sections 4, 5 and 6 of the Bill shall be expended by January 1 of 1977. These Sections pertain to the Bureau of the Budget and do not affect the Governor's Office of Manpower and Human Development. The printing line item is not affected because of the need to begin printing budget material earlier in the fiscal year. Senate Amendment #2 deletes reference to the Governor's Office of Manpower and Human Development and inserts in lieu thereof, the Bureau of the Budget and the Executive Office of the Governor. This was considered necessary in the light of the fact that the Governor's Office of Manpower and Human Development does not have to enable statutes or Executive Order providing for its creation, powers and duties. Without express statutory authority, this function must be funded through B.O.B. Senate Amendment #3 revised the grants in aid for state-wide and balance of state CETA manpower programs by providing more detailed and grants to state agencies and it breaks out operations contained in the grants. Also, earmarked \$200,000 for the Illinois Bureau of Employment Securities for the purpose of improving the coordination of employment, unemployment and occupation data on the county level for various purposes in order to identify the potential supply bottleneck with respect to economic development to establish data sources on employment and maintain an up-to-date file on hard to fill job positions. Senate Amendment #4, Mr. Speaker, deletes \$36,000 from the Bureau of the Budget for the administrative cost to be incurred in the sale of state bonds from the School Construction Fund. This has been specifically requested by the Bureau pursuant to an interpretation of current law by the State Comptroller which indicates that only the Capital Development Board may administer bond sales for the School Construction Fund. Senate Amendment #5 increased the general revenue appropriation of the Bureau of the Budget for the salaries and expenses of a transition task force designated by the Governor elect to provide for the orderly transition of the Office of the Governor and this is a \$50,000 addition. Senate Amendment #6 adds language to the Bill



pertaining to \$200,000 from the Bureau of Employment Securities earmarked in Senate Amendment #3 providing that this amount may also be used for its original purpose in the granting of funds to local police... prime sponsors or CETA program operators to conduct labor force analysis and improvements of the coordination of employment and unemployment services programs. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Totten: "Ted, I have a question on Senate Amendment #3 for the \$200,000 grant. My understanding is presently there is no grant application for the purposes outlined in the Amendment. And my understanding also from it is they cannot pinpoint the impact of this and I'm wondering why we have done what we've done in Amendment #3 if there is..."

Lechowicz: "Don, you've also got to take a look when you look at Amendment #3, take a look at Amendment #6 which also provides for the earmarked \$200,000 that this may be also used for the original purpose of the grants, funds to local prime sponsors of CETA program operators."

Totten: "That does not answer the question of where's the grant application to do it. There is none."

Lechowicz: "No, the \$200,000 for the Illinois Bureau of Employment Securities is specific. It's earmarking the money for the purpose of improving the coordination of employment, unemployment, and occupational data on the county level. There would have to be a grant."

Totten: "Yeah, there has to be an application in the (unintelligible) and there is none."

Lechowicz: "I don't believe you have to have an application for it. We're specifically earmarking that money for that purpose and if it is not designated for that purpose, it reverts back to its original intent."

Totten: "Why didn't they put it in the original request, then?"



Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, what?"

Totten: "Why didn't they put it in the original request?"

Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, I can't answer that."

Totten: "Well, when I walked over, I was wondering if we could talk about it or you could... otherwise, you can concur in all but 3 and 6 till we can get those straightened out. Cause they're related. 1, 2, 4 and 5 we have no problems with, but 3 and 6 I... there's still some question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Why don't we just pull it out of the record and we'll... because then we'll have to come back on another concurrence and we'll talk about 3 and 6 right away."

Totten: "Fine."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. Out of the record. Senate Bills, Third Reading. On Senate Bills, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1935. Representative Hanahan."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1935. An Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Board of Education and so forth. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1935 is the operation grant and the pension funding for the Office of Education Bill. Teacher retirement grants also is involved in this Bill which is a departure from past practice that... of different Bills that have gone through the House and Senate in past years. The total bottom line on this piece of legislation is \$861,964,500. That is both state and federal funding of which the State of Illinois General Revenue Fund comes to \$498,961,500. The Bill is many pages thick. If there are questions, we had three days, four days of hearings in the Appropriations Committee. It has been researched, reviewed, and unglued in every way possible plus debate on Second Reading on the floor of the House. If there are any questions that I could answer, I will; but this is the Bill on the Office of Education, the grants and the teacher funding for the pension system. And I move its adoption."



Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. Representative Catania, you're too mild and gentle. Representative Catania."

Catania: "Mr. Speaker, I've two conflicts in this Bill. My mother's a retired Chicago teacher and I expect I will benefit from the textbooks for private schools. And I'd like to vote 'aye'."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite 'aye', Choate 'aye', Washington 'aye', Yourell 'aye', Ewell 'aye', Kosinski 'aye', Waddell 'aye', Sevcik 'aye', Madison 'present', Hirschfeld 'aye', Caldwell 'aye', Hill 'aye', Richmond 'aye'. What's the score, Mr. Clerk? On this question there's 144 'aye' and 1 'no'; and the Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. 1610."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1610, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and . . . a Bill for an Act to provide the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Insurance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Merlo."

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1610 is the appropriation Bill for the Department of Insurance. The original asking was \$4,177,600. The Senate reduced the amount by \$76,521; and the present asking is \$4,101,079. I ask your favorable consideration of this appropriation Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have no intentions of asking anyone to vote in opposition to this particular legislation; but I'd like to point out to you that I requested the Sponsor to hold this Bill up for a couple of days, and he was gracious enough to do it; but we have as an acting director in that particular department, the Department of Insurance, who has only been with the department a very short period of time; and I hope he is ended in his capacity as acting director after July 1st. All you people realize that Mr. Duncan will take over at that time; and I intend requesting of Mr. Duncan to go over what this young fellow has done within the Department of Insurance. I think it's a disgrace to each and everyone of us what he has done in the field of workmen's compensation. He was the hearing officer on this particular last raise in regards to the 24 percent; and, consequently, when he became acting director, and he will only be in this capacity for a matter of a couple of weeks, he went ahead and granted that increase; and as far as I'm concerned,



he handed that increase to the insurance people with very little knowledge of what's going on in this particular field. I'd like to point out to you that it's about time that the Manufacturer's Association and the Chamber of Commerce get together and come to a conclusion that their enemies are the Department of Insurance and the large insurance companies, not only in the State of Illinois, but throughout the United States. It's about time they realized that these are the groupings that are giving it to them in regards to insurance here in the State of Illinois. I'd like to point out to you that I've had a few complaints, and I've also had them on liability; and this is what the insurance companies are doing to these people. We enacted no legislation in the last Session of the General Assembly relative to liability insurance; and, consequently, their insurance has gone up well over 100 percent. I'd just like to point out to you that, as far as I'm concerned, and I'm going to vote 'no', I'm not going to ask anyone else to do this; but I'm doing it in protest, I'm doing it in protest because I . . . you do believe that the acting director has taken advantage of the manufacturers and the business people of the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, uniquely, the Department of Insurance last year increased workmen's compensation rates by 46.7 percent without a hearing. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I didn't hear anyone on the floor of the House last year say that we didn't fund the Department of Insurance with enough money . . ."

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

Merlo: "A point of or . . . a point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Merlo: "This is not a workmen's compensation Bill, this is the appropriation of the Department of Insurance; and I hope that the Representative will direct his remark to the appropriation."

Speaker Redmond: "Your point is well taken. Confine your remarks to the Bill."



Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, in confining my marks . . . remarks to the Bill, I'm talking about the amount of money that is unnecessary to appropriate to operate the Department of Insurance business. Part of that business is a rip-off that they allow . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Confine your remarks to the Bill, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: ". . . this is the people of this state . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Confine your remarks to the appropriation."

Hanahan: ". . . absolutely to this appropriation, I want to know from the Sponsor if whether or not in this Bill, if the Sponsor would yield, is there enough money in this Bill to conduct hearings for the people of the State of Illinois to determine whether or not rate increases are proper or not? Is there enough money in the Bill, Mr. Sponsor?"

Merlo: "In answer to that question, I can tell you that there is no appropriation for hearing, however, any previous hearings that were heard, the billings were directly to the insurance industry and I would imagine that this would be the pattern that would be followed in the future, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to hear that there's enough money in the Bill to prepare for another hearing somewhere down the line for the Department of Insurance to conduct its business properly; and I suggest to the Membership of this House that the greatest rip-off that has happened in the Department of Insur . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre, for what reason do you arise?"

Beaupre: "Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Beaupre: "The Gentleman . . . the Gentleman is, indeed, out of order, and . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Your point is well taken. Mr. Hanahan, please, confine your remarks to the Bill."

Hanahan: ". . . I am trying to confine my remarks to the Bill . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, do more than try and succeed."

Hanahan: ". . . it's very hard to discuss an area . . . discuss an area that's ripped-off the people . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hill. Representative Hill, for what



purpose do you arise?"

Hill: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is the appropriation for the Department of Insurance; and they control workmen's compensation insurance, and if that isn't part of this appropriation, I don't know what's going on around here; and I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, being part of the Department of Insurance, and they have control on Workmen's Compensation, we have the right to discuss it; and I refuse to allow . . ."

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

Beaupre: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Illinois is not a rating state. Several years ago, we took away from the Department of . . ."

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

Beaupre: ". . . on a point of order!"

Speaker Redmond: "What's your point? What's your point?"

Beaupre: "Well, if Mr. Hanahan will calm down a little bit, I'll try to make it."

Speaker Redmond: "Make your point."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, Illinois is not a rating state, that means that the Department of Insur . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Make your point of order, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: ". . . the Department of Insurance does not have the right to . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "That is not a point of order. Mr. Hanahan, proceed, and please confine your remarks to the Bill."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker . . . Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the State of Illinois is a rating state in the Department of Insurance for workmen's compensation. That's the problem. That's what I'm addressing myself to on this appropriation. The fact is that this department under its acting director has ripped-off the people of Illinois and has drained the Legislature for it. They granted an increase in workmen's compensation with no hearing; and they didn't say they didn't have enough money. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, they have already agreed for another increase, and they had, listen to this, they had a hearing, they had a hearing about how much more money they want to charge



the people of Illinois for their insurance on workmen's compensation. And let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, there was one Legislator that was there at this hearing, and I didn't see any business group there objecting to this rate increase; but I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, when the business community comes in with another rash of letters, thousands of phone calls, all sorts of, you know, worrisome arguments about the rate increases that has come upon them. They're going to say it's because of the Legislature, when the fact remains it's the Department of Insurance that has done this; and their appropriation reflects this."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the House. I'm pleased to find out who caused the raise in the workmen's compensation, and I find out now it was the Department of Insurance; and I'm going to join with Jack Hill and vote against this appropriation. I think it's a good vote; and I'd urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "Does the . . . would the Sponsor yield to a question, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will. Representative Merlo."

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

Tipword: "Representative Merlo . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute."

Merlo: ". . . I true . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipword has asked if you would yield. Will you yield?"

Tipword: ". . . would you . . . will he yield, Sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "If Representative Telcser would leave him alone, why I think we can . . ."

Tipword: "Representative Merlo, I . . ."

Merlo: ". . . is there a question?"

Tipword: ". . . I need to ask you a question about the appropriation Bill and the . . . how the . . . that the department will have sufficient funds under it to do something to give the acting director some time, particularly. Now, this I want you to understand.



It's something that I'm sure you probably know nothing about, but I want to ask about though. Is the Bill sufficient to give the acting director or whoever may be in that seat of authority or who may be . . . have the opportunity to answer inquiries of the Members of the Legislature, will the present acting director, or whoever may be inquired of in that department, have adequate time by virtue of the appropriations made in this Bill so that they can answer inquiries of the Members of the Legislature without having Members of the Legislature called inappropriate and insulting names?"

Merlo: "Well, Representative Tipsword, I don't know what occurred."

Tipsword: "I know you don't."

Merlo: "But . . . yeah, I'm sure that you know my history and background . . ."

Tipsword: "Absolutely."

Merlo: ". . . as far as the workemen's compensation is concerned and as far as the unions are concerned; but I don't think that this is relative . . . relevent to the appropriation Bill that's being considered here this morning. You and I know that Director Wilcox is no longer with the department; and you and I know that there's going to be a change in the very near future. Now, if you're going to jeopardize the orderly operation of government, go ahead and do it; but I'm going ahead with the Bill; and if you vote it down, I'm not even going to put it on Postponed Consideration; but if you want to take the responsibility, great."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "May I have some order, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "We'll try. Give the Gentleman order."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to clarify a point that was discussed two . . . about two to three minutes with Representative Jack Beaupre. The point and charges made that the Department of Insurance does . . . or the question was whether they do or do not regulate the rate



increases. I'd like to inform the House that our discussion with Representative Beaupre and, of course, the Department of Insurance does authorize the rate increases and adjustments on their official order from the Department of Insurance of the State of Illinois. So they have in many cases disapproved rate increases; but they only disapprove it after the petition . . . they only have a hearing after the petition has been denied. We're at a point now that, I think, what happened to clarify the situation is that Director Wilcox disapproved the 24.3 percent increase, and Mr. Trevillion then held a hearing and approved the same thing that Director Wilcox had turned down; but I would like to make it clear that the department does authorize the rates and the increases in workmen's compensation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman, G.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the question's . . . Representative Merlo, I thought it was Hanahan."

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker . . . Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I just want to call your attention to the fact that you're talking about a department that brings in excess of \$60,000,000 to the General Revenue. You're talking about a department that in Illinois it was second in the number of companies licensed to do business, second in the number of domestic companies residing within the state, and third in the aggravated premium volume written, \$5,769,000; and yet interesting enough, this Illinois State ranked sixth in the nation in the amount of funds spent for the operation of the Insurance Department. I ask your favorable consideration of this Bill."

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



Pierce: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we in this House and my colleague, the Gentleman from McHenry, can shout and scream all we want and try and place the blame somewhere else; and insurance companies have blamed, but let's not look to the stars for our troubles, let's look to ourselves once in a while. I voted for a bad, bad workmen's compensation Bill last year that caused increases in insurance. I'm man enough to stand up and admit it that we need meaningful Amendments to that Bill; and I certainly hope . . . I certainly hope in this Session that we in the Legislature will not do a cosmetic job, but will pass Amendments to work with compensation that allow the 'roper', the small carpentry contractor, the small plumbing contractor to get workmen's compensation and stay in business. Let's not drive the small businessman out of business, and let's not blame and put the blame on someone else all the time. Let's look to ourselves on occasion; and believe me, the public isn't fooled. The public knows that we passed a Bill that went too far, and we admit it ourselves by trying to amend it this year. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Choate."

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my vote from an entirely different matter. It doesn't have anything to do with workmen's compensation; and it certainly doesn't have anything to do with the distinguished Sponsor of this Bill. But when the directing . . . acting director of this department has the audacity to stand before a Member of this House and call him a hack, and that he doesn't know what he's talking about, and I'm referring to my good friend, Jack Hill. I'm not going to vote to give him the money to run his department, until he comes up and tells Jack Hill that he's sorry, that he didn't know what he was talking about, and that he didn't mean it. I vote 'present'."

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

Skinner: "I've heard Representative Hill called a lot of things, but never a hack. Nevertheless, that's not going to govern my vote,



nor is the fact that my vote on the workmen's compensation Bill last year gave me more hell than any other vote I've ever had in this House; but I'm going to vote 'present' until I get an answer to a question that Director Wilcox promised in the Appropriation's Committee over a month ago; and that was the contact . . . that he would contact the insurance industry and let us know on the House floor how much every Bill amending the Workmen's Compensation Act would bring the rates up or down. Now, that letter has finally been written by his successor. I expect the answer will come shortly after we adjourn, and that's about when I'll be ready to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I suppose part of the problem on this Bill arises from a hearing that was held, and it's entitled, Hearing #1582, and it was signed allowing an increase, as I read it, on June the 16th; but perhaps . . . perhaps both labor and industry ought to file a lawsuit and get that into court, and they've got another 15 or 20 days to do it, and see if the director was correct, or the acting director was correct, and see where the money comes from that's necessary to do this. But in the meantime, I can't see why we're stopping this department from functioning."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think to fail to pass this Bill would be an irresponsible act on our part. I have no knowledge of what has happened with the present director; but this is one of the few departments that operates from money that doesn't come from General Revenue or from the taxpayers. It's operated, it's paid for by the people who are regulated. Now, there's a lot of areas besides workmen's comp. here, we're talking about homeowners insurance, we're talking about life insurance, we're talking about a whole lot of things besides workmen's compensation; but if you want to destroy the Department of Insurance, just go ahead and vote 'no'. If you want to be responsible and keep up this department, you better vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."



Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in response to Representative Tipsword's inquiry, the question certainly deserves an answer. The Department of Insurance does have sufficient funds to answer courtesies . . . courteously and properly any inquiry from a Member of the Legislature. The other point I would make is that the department does not have enough money now or in the past to hire an actuary who would be in a position to determine whether or not these rates are proper. As a result of that, I'm sure the House will be interested in knowing that the rates which control the present workmen's compensation premiums in Illinois are determined by the National Council on Compensation Insurance, which is a New York organization, which compiles the statistics from all the states. The Department of Illi . . . Insurance in the State of Illinois does not yet have any record upon which to base the projected increases. They may or may not be valid; but as many Speakers have indicated, the department on the whole, and the Insurance Study Commission has time and again found fault with that department and will continue to do so, but on the whole they are an eager, honest bunch of individual workers trying to do a good job. I suspect that after these comments on the floor of the House, Deputy Director Trévillion and his colleague will be well aware of the dangerous ice upon which they are treading. But we can promise you that any Legislator, any citizen, will get a direct and speedy answer on any inquiry made to the Department of Insurance. The funds are in this appropriation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well, thank you very much. Well, I don't know whether the director was right or wrong in granting the hearing, and that's a matter that can be resolved in the court; but he was wrong in making the statement he made to Representative Hill; and I'm also advised that another part of the statement was he wasn't going to listen to any Legislator, and I think it's right that we hold this Bill and vote 'present' until he apologizes to Representative Hill and this General Assembly for his remarks."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was moved by Representative Hill and Representative Hanahan, and I'm 'no' on the Bill; but we all know that before we leave here that the Department of Insurance is going to have its appropriation. So really we're giving them a message, and I'm voting 'no' right now. I agree that the acting director should not have acted in the manner that he did to Representative Hill, and I've seen some like that in other Committees, and I think they're acting improperly. I also make the point, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we've gone through some hearings relative to conflicts of interests. Elected officials, Legislators are always fair game. We, as Legislators, ought to look at the conflicts of interest in the Executive Department. That, I think, is a grosser injustice to these people of the State of Illinois. When we have a State Fire Marshall, who is on leave of absence from the Marathon Oil Company, and his . . . and he in December may say that we're going to have self-service stations, which are going to benefit the major oil companies. When he . . . we have the director, who now is going to take a position that shows some conflict of interest in the Department of Insurance, I think we ought to start looking at our impeachment procedures and start doing something as a Legislature in that regard. I'm going to change my vote from 'no' to 'yes'; but I want to tell the Department of Insurance that we have just sent them a message."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, by way of explaining my vote, I was persuaded by some of the Gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, who made the point that workmen's compensation insurance rates were increased by the Department of Insurance, certainly, they had nothing to do with the Bill that was passed last year. This was all a scheme on the part of the Department of Insurance to raise insurance premiums for the people of this State of Illinois without any reason whatsoever, and had nothing to do with the passage of Senate Bills



234 and 235. Their arguments persuaded me; but later arguments indicated to me that the second increase in insurance premiums, some 24 percent, was granted only after the department held full public hearings. Now, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Director of Insurance and the Insurance Department has shown the proper contrite spirit and that they now are willing to hold the hearings that are being demanded by the other side. It seems to me also, Mr. Speaker, that the people of the State of Illinois need this department to protect them against the possibility of insurance company failure, which is very, very real in the State of Illinois at the present time. There are many, many insurance companies with financial statements that are in sad, sad condition; and the Department of Insurance is the watchdog to make sure that people who buy insurance will, in fact, be able to collect on their policies; and for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I'm persuaded and I'm going to vote for . . . 'yes' on the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will . . . Representative Merlo."

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in explaining my vote, I want to tell you that I am truly ashamed, ashamed because of a personal affront to one Member of the House of Representatives that the people of Illinois are made to suffer. Your voting against this Bill could deny the State of Illinois \$60,000,000 in revenue funds; you can bring about insolvency in the State of Illinois that will affect many thousands and thousands of policyholders; and because of a personal affront, you vote against this Bill. Well, I told Representative Shea and all of you that I will not postpone consideration, that I will let the Bill go down, and put the onus on those that feel because of this personal affront they should not vote for this Bill; and I . . . if this is it, Mr. Speaker, I'll take it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I fully concur with Representative Merlo, and Representative Friedrich and also Representative Shea. I am no friend of the insurance companies.



I, for a long time, have been very, very much incensed with some of their dealings; but I will say this, we should not deprive the people of the State of Illinois about \$6 . . . of about \$60,000,000 in revenue. I do feel that a new administration will look into all these items more carefully than ever before, and I'm changing my vote to 'aye'."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I, too, know that eventually this Bill must pass, and I think we would be better students if we would get on with our business; and if we want to take some other action against them, I suggest we either put . . . get a . . . get a Commission or a Subcommittee in order to do something about it; but I think holding up the entire budget of the department is unreasonable. I think we've made our point, and I think we ought to go on and vote this Bill out because it must be done. I vote 'aye'."

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

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in my opening remarks, I said that I wasn't going to ask anyone else to vote in opposition to this piece of legislation. I did say that I was going to vote in opposition to it as a protest. I continue to vote 'no', and I will continue to vote 'no'. I don't want to impede any department of state government. It seems to me that we have a problem in the Department of Insurance; and one Legislator said that the Department of Insurance has no control over workmen's compensation insurance. I want to point out that they do. This is the only area. Now, I'd like to say this, and reiterate a previous remark. . . ."

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

Schuneman: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Schuneman: "I believe this Gentleman spoke on debate, and we have a rule against his explaining his vote."



Speaker Redmond: "You're correct. Representative Shea, for what purpose do you arise?"

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I spoke in debate or not, but I think this is a fairly serious matter, and I think Representative Hill ought to be allowed to speak."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has raised . . . has risen to a point of personal privilege, and he's recognized for that purpose. Yeah, some said, 'Over the hill'. Representative Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker, if nothing else comes out of this, I would appreciate very much if the manufacturers in the business community of the State of Illinois find out who their enemy has been in the field of insurance. Now, the first meeting that was held, there were no notifications sent out. I'm very upset about this. That director is not here anymore. The present acting director in . . . increased this, even though it was turned down once; and you can find that in the order that was issued by him. I didn't think it was proper for him to do that in a matter of just two weeks. He isn't going to be here very long I have been led to believe. I think that's an improvement in the department. Again, I'm going to vote 'no'; but I'm not going to ask anyone else to vote 'no'; and that's the way I feel about it. I want to send 'em a message. I don't think we should employ an individual of that stature in any department of the State of Illinois because if he's talking to Legislators like he talked to me, you can feel confident when he gets phone calls he's talking to your constituents the same way. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, 117 'ayes' and 12 'nos' . . . Representative Washburn, for what purpose do you arise?"

Washburn: "Well, I've been here and my light's been on for 15 minutes to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, explain your vote."

Washburn: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we on this side of the aisle have sat here now for some half an hour in some state of amazement and some . . . some state of joy watching



the Members on the other side of the aisle squirm and wriggle trying to get out of a situation that they created last year themselves trying to blame the Department of Insurance, rather than the Democratic Members of this House. Now, it was their action last year that resulted in a loss of about 6 percent of the businesses in Illinois and some \$90,000 . . . some 90,000 jobs. They can't blame the Department of Insurance. They only have themselves to blame; and, certainly, I'm happy now to vote green on this Bill; but it's not taking the monkey off of their backs. They can't blame the Department of Insurance for what happened here last year, only they can take the blame on the other side of the aisle."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Hudson 'aye', Washburn 'aye', Hoffman 'aye'. Ebbesen 'aye', Waddell 'aye', Ryan 'aye', Porter 'aye', Fleck 'aye', Winchester 'aye' . . . maybe it's easier to dump this one, is it? No, no, I've been . . . okay, all in favor . . . the question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'; have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, 140 'aye' and no . . . 9 'no'; and the Bill having received the constitutional majority is, hereby, declared passed. Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Fire Marshall of the State of Illinois, Mr. Robert G. Walsh, comes from Lawrence County. He is a distinguished resident of our county, who enjoys the confidence and respect of everyone who knows him. Any innuendo or insinuation that he is in somehow cahoots against the interests of the people of the State of Illinois is despicable and unworthy of the person who made. . . ."

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

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know if this is a point of order. I think he's out of line. We're not on a . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "You're correct. You're not addressing yourself to anything pend . . . on what?"



Cunningham: ". . . Mr. Speaker . . . it is a point of order, and the Representative from Lake County, I . . . he attacked Walsh unmercifully there a moment ago."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks . . ."

Cunningham: "The only thing bad I know about Walsh is . . ."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . bring your remarks . . ."

Cunningham: ". . . that he's a Democrat. He's 100 percent Democrat; but I'll not sit here and let him be slandered in the manner that he was. He's a gentleman."

Speaker Redmond: ". . . bring your remarks to a close. Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think maybe Roscoe Cunningham will have ample opportunity. I just filed House Resolution 939 to investigate the State Fire Marshall. If you want in on it, put your name on the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 3411, Representative Van Duyne? Van Duyne here? Out of the Record. 3817, Representative Lechowicz? Representative Washburn. I can't see you, there's somebody standing between you and the Chair. Will the Gentleman standing between Representative Washburn and the Chair please sit down?"

(con't on next page)



Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know that all the Members are concerned with the condition of our beloved colleague, Chuck Campbell. I just had a report from his wife. She was permitted to see him for the first time a few minutes ago since he entered the hospital at midnight last night. Chuck's a very serious... seriously ill. However, she reported that his condition is more stable. He was alert and somewhat cheerful and asking about his fellow Legislators and how things were proceeding in the House. So, our prayers will be with Chuck. He'll be in intensive care for some period of time and I know we all pray and hope for his recovery."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3817, as you know, was called a little bit earlier and I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. And at that time I explained Senate Amendments 1 through 6 and it was withdrawn from the record based upon a question posed by Representative Totten in reference to Amendments 3 and 6. I believe both of those questions have been answered and now move, Mr. Speaker, that we do concur in Senate Bill... House Bill 3817 and the Senate Amendments."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman makes a motion that the House do concur in Senate Amendments #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, and #6 to House Bill 3817. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'nay'. This is final action. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On these questions, there are 148 'ayes', 4 'nays', 1 Member voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments' #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 to House Bill 3817. On the order of House Bills, Second Reading. House Bills, Second Reading appears House Bill 991. Mr. Farley, do you wish that called? Is he here? Take it out of the record. House Bill 3256, Mr. Rayson. Read the Bill."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 3256. A Bill for an Act in relation to the legitimization of parentage and substantive rights of children, amends certain Acts in connection therewith. Second



Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Shea: "Are there any Amendments from the floor? Third Reading. House Bill 3656."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 3656. A Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Bond Act. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment amends House Bill 3656 page 1, line 10 and so forth."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Winnebago. Mr. Bradley, do you seek recognition, sir?"

Bradley: "Yes, sir, Mr. Speaker. For the purpose of announcement, I'm delighted to be able to introduce to the House of Representatives today Representative VonBoeckman's wife, Norma, along with his daughter, Barbara, her husband, Major Edward Huber of the U.S. Air Force and their three children. I wish they'd stand and be recognized. They're in the Speaker's balcony."

Speaker Shea: "Back to the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, on House Bill 3656."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this is the Capital Development Bonding Authority Authorization Act and the first Committee Amendment is not mine. I want to resist that Amendment because it makes Middle Fork again out of the, this authorization for the Capital Development Authority. We've debated that question fully and I feel that to expedite the matters of the House, we'd just go into Roll Calls on these Amendments."

Speaker Shea: "Is there debate? Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the Gentleman's great desire not to have the flakiness of the various projects he's proposing to be brought forth, but I really think that this Bill should be taken out of the record as it has been in past days until Representative Craig who is extremely interested in the Middle Fork can return and until Representative Campbell's condition can stabilize. I certainly am not personally going to be held responsible for Representative Campbell's deteriorating health and I will not persist in this Amendment. But I think that Representative Giorgi is seizing upon a situation over which he has no... well, over which he does have complete control and I



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

think he should take it out of the record and wait until we see what the Senate's going to do with it."

Speaker Shea: "Well, I can only make one statement and that is the hour grows late and these are House Bills on Second and Third Reading."

Skinner: "Well, it wasn't myself that asked that it be held for Representative Craig. It was the other side."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, for what purpose do you arise, sir?"

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if anybody offered the Amendment but I was going to move to table it. After all, the two Gentleman who do have the most interest in the matter unavoidably can't be here and we don't know when they can be here and there's... when we had a full House, there was a full attendance, we debated the matter for two and one-half hours, so we made that determination already. And in fact, Robert's Rules does state that you cannot bring the same issue again that has been decided by prior motion. And I really think that under Robert's Rules, this is really out of order; and so therefore, Mr. Speaker, we all are concerned about Representative Campbell and we're fairly certain that it'll be very difficult for him to come back in these closing days. He fought against this Amendment and fought hard and long and therefore, I'm going to move to table Committee Amendment #1."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves to table Committee Amendment #1. And on that question, the Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Coffey."

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

Speaker Shea: "Excuse me, sir. Mr. Lundy, for what purpose do you arise?"

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Is this motion to table debatable?"

Speaker Shea: "I've lost the Parliamentarian. We run into some parliamentary problems and in the opinion of the Chair, a motion to table is really what is considered by Robert's a motion to postpone indefinitely under #59 which in the opinion of the Chair is a debatable motion. Now, the Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Coffey."



Coffey: "Well, Mr. Speaker.. I will yield to the vote on this to table this Amendment if that is the... and I would like to reserve my right to speak on the Roll Call; but I would yield for the Roll Call at this time."

Speaker Shea: "Before we go further, I'd like to introduce a guest in the chambers, the Honorable Alan Dixon, Treasurer of the State of Illinois. Now, on the motion to table, the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, the maker of the motion comments about this being basically an illegal motion because it's approaching the same subject or about as relevant as his comments about the State Fire Marshal's obvious conflict of interest in making a decision on self-service gas stations. I had already stated that I was not going to persist with the Amendment with myself as Sponsor and I would ask leave of this House to be withdrawn as the Sponsor at this point and if anybody else wants to be the Sponsor, they certainly may."

Speaker Shea: "All right, the Gentleman asks leave to withdraw as Sponsor. Does he... is there objection? Of Amendment #1, does he have leave? Hearing no objections, he will be withdrawn as Sponsor. Is there a Member that wishes to become Sponsor of the Resolution or the Amendment, I'm sorry. Mr. Washburn, the Minority Leader, for what purpose do you seek recognition, sir?"

Washburn: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just wanted to say something to Representative Skinner. I know this is of extreme importance to him, this Amendment and I think that I want to personally thank him for his understanding and his withdrawing of this Amendment at this time. I think he should be complimented for it. Thank you."

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

Maragos: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. When an Amendment is adopted by a Committee, can a single Sponsor withdraw that Amendment? That's the question I wanted to ask the future."

Speaker Shea: "Well, he asked to be... asked leave of the House to be withdrawn as the Sponsor."



Maragos: "The question is..."

Speaker Shea: "All right, well, I'm going to get to that right now.

It is going to be laying on the table at the present time without a Sponsor. And if I cannot find a House Sponsor for it, I'm going to ask leave of the House to table it. All right now, is there any Member of the House that wishes to sponsor the Amendment #1? If nobody is going to sponsor it, I will ask leave of the House to order the Amendment tabled. Is there objection? Is there objection? Hearing no objections, the Amendment will be ordered tabled. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Committee Amendment #2, lost in Committee. Committee Amendment #3, Schuneman. Amends House Bill 3656 page 1, line 22 and so forth."

Speaker Shea: "All right, on Amendment #3, Mr. Schuneman's the Sponsor, I understand; but prior to the time I get there, for what purpose does the Minority Spokesman on Appropriations I rise, Mr. Totten?"

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of order. The Gentleman from Lake in his remarks indicated that we should not be considering twice the same matter. I would like to point out to the House the serious question that raises when we're dealing with an authorization Bill such as this that we prior dealt with the appropriation Bill. This is the authorization Bill. And the serious question that faces this House when we get both on Third Reading is do the dollar figures match? And I think that in each Amendment as we go through even though we may have debated them on the appropriation Bill or the reappro. that these matters should be considered so that we come up with the same dollar figures in the end."

Speaker Shea: "The House, we're just going to hold 3656 for a minute and let the Clerk read a notice with regard to a Conference Committee."

Clerk Selcke: "The Members appointed to the Conference Committee on House Bill 3392 are as follows. Jaffe, Gerald Bradley, E.M. Barnes, Totten, and Ryan. A meeting of the Members of this Conference



Committee will be held Friday, June 25th at the hour of 12:30 in the East House Corridor."

Speaker Shea: "All right now, on Amendment #3, read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #3. Amends House Bill 3656 on page 1, line 22 by inserting immediately after the period, the following. 'Proceeds of bonds issued under this Act may be used only for Capital facilities having a demonstrable life of not less than 25 years.'"

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I'm aware that Representative... oh, Schuneman is here now."

Speaker Shea: "All right, so excuse me. Now back to the Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman, on Amendment #3, sir, to House Bill 3656."

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #3 was adopted in Committee and the purpose of the Amendment is to guarantee that projects completed by the use of Capital Development Funds actually be for Capital development as most of us consider Capital development. We found, in Committee, that some of the projects being proposed by the Capital Development Board were in the nature of maintenance of buildings, were things that you and I in our personal lives would think of as maintenance of our homes, maintenance of our factory buildings, that sort of thing. And I think that that's contrary to the original concept of the Capital Development Board. My concept and I think the concept of those people who originated the idea of the Capital Development Board is that these are funds that are to be made available for completing capital projects such as building schools, building other... other projects which will have a long life and not something that would be used to pay for the ordinary maintenance and operation expenses of state government. And this is the reason the Amendment was adopted in Committee and I would urge its approval by the House."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, at the Committee hearing, everyone seemed to



agree with Representative Schuneman and Stear... and in intent, but no one could guarantee to the bondholders that in fact the life of those items would be at least 25 years without creating another category of insurance. So, I'd like to resist this Amendment because no one can guarantee that there'll be 25 years of life in anything we sell bonds for. And that's the reason why I'd like to resist the Amendment."

Speaker Shea: "Is there further discussion? Mr. Schuneman, to close."

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think that it's perfectly obvious to any reasonably intelligent person that a well-constructed building would, for example, have life of 25 or more years, whereas a picnic table might very likely not have a life of 25 years and should, therefore, not be the subject of Capital Development Bond money and I would urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Shea: "All those in favor of the Amendment will say 'aye'. Those opposed will say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'nos' have it. Do they want a Roll Call? All those in favor of the Amendment will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos, to explain his vote."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, although I agree in principle with what the Sponsor of this Amendment is trying to do, I think we should all be aware that there's a very big chance in this particular Amendment that you will destroy all other bonding that has been on record now for the last 10 years because in the Amendment they refer to any capital development in this Act; and it not only takes, refers to the particular Bill in question, but it also refers to the whole Capital Development Bonding Act and we may have a kettle of fish and a kettle of worms which will make all bonding authority and all projects which are now in effect become abso... null and void. Therefore, I ask you to be very careful about voting for this Amendment because you're going to destroy all capital development bonding. Although, as I say, I agree in principle with what the Sponsor of this Amendment is trying to do, he... I think the approach that he



uses here and because of the language of the Amendment, there'll be some technicalities which might destroy all bonding."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, to explain his vote."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment in variegation to the last speaker, would not destroy past capital development bonding. This is not a retroactive Amendment. This Amendment clearly says we're not going to buy picnic tables and washers with bonded money and I say if we don't want to destroy the capital development set-up in this state for funding things, we would vote 'yes' on this and put some backbone into our capital development program so that it's money used for true capital development and not for minor repairs and I would ask an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian, to explain his vote."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have sometimes heard the phrase, killing a fly with a sledgehammer. I don't remember when I've ever used it, but I've heard it. I earnestly say to you that if this Amendment were passed, we would be using a sledgehammer on the entire Capital Bond Development Program. There is no way that an accountant or a tax man or an insurance analyst or anyone knowledgeable about guidelines for amortization schedules could live with the kind of phraseology that's in this Amendment. I, too, have a general predisposition to agree with the purpose of the Amendment; but if this Amendment were passed, I would venture to say that no future expenditure of Capital Development Bonds could be relied upon. The internal revenue service has a series of guidelines which themselves are not made mandatory because no one knows the life of many elements and structures and improvements that are amortized and have some kind of useful life. In a visit to Lincoln School, the Lincoln Development Center, I witnessed the construction of some extensive remodeling of buildings that house our mentally retarded citizens. These are planned for about an 8 or 10 year period because of the overall program. Adopting this Amendment



in conclusion, would create great mischief and will be counter-productive. And I urge you to vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney, to explain his vote."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent Amendment that Representative Schuneman is proposing. Take a look at what was in that C.D. budget this year. You've got picnic tables, you've got playground equipment, you've got boat docks, you've got pole sheds; types of things that really could never be considered as capital items. There's even bond money in there to tear down buildings, not to construct them. I think the only way that we're ever going to get the attention of this agency and the other agencies of state government is to get back on track as to what Capital Development Bond money should be used for. And I think it's indeed a quite a stretch of the imagination to say that minor items such as this can properly be bonded. The only way we're ever going to get a handle on this thing is to support Representative Schuneman's Amendment."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Capital means major and development doesn't mean tearing down things. Last year we were going to spend money cutting grass and replacing glass. This year, we're going to buy picnic tables. I just do not understand why we don't want to spend money that is going to cost us \$1.73 for every dollar that we borrow and interest and principle repayment. I don't know why we don't want it to last at least as long as the bonds will take to pay off. To vote against this Amendment, it seems to me, is a passing the buck to future generations of politicians. Now, that's what we generally do, but that doesn't make it right."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Amendment is the protection for the protection and the absolute bonding program that we have in the State of Illinois. If we don't pass this Amendment, we're going to be funding projects that may



only last one, two, or three years. And it certainly is reasonable to expect that if we're going to sell bonds with a maturity of 20 years, we ought to expect the property being bonded ought to last at least that long. Now, we're talking about in this case and in the capital development projects, picnic tables, pole buildings which may have a life of two, three years. And if we don't put this Amendment on, we're going to find that next year we're going to do more of this type of bond programs. We're going to increase all these nonlasting items and it's extremely important that we stop it now so that the bonding program in the Capital Development Board remains sound. This is an extremely essential Amendment and I would ask for a green vote."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. LaFleur."

LaFleur: "I could not urge too strongly a green light to put this Amendment on. It was utterly amazing in the Revenue Committee when we talked to the people from the Capital Development Bond and asked what the guidelines were that they applied before they would put any item on a bonding schedule. And their reply in Committee was that they had no guidelines. So apparently, this new method of financing ordinary and everyday expenditures of state government has taken place. The administration has not only devised new schemes of getting money from the taxpayer, but they are devising new schemes of putting ordinary expenditures on to a 25 year bonding schedule. I would think everybody and especially the people who are going to return here next year and it's going to be necessary for them to examine the financial position of the state, to look at this very carefully because you are committing many dollars, many of your future dollars that could be used for ordinary expenses to the retirement of bonds. For the very thought of putting items on a 25 year bonding schedule that would last less than one year is almost unthinkable. I think you're buying built-in trouble for the future. It's going to be hard to live with and it's certainly going to put the state in a higher critical position than it is right now. I would urge a green vote."



Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman, to explain his vote."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I honestly think that this Amendment is one of the most important issues we're going to vote on down here this year. The Capital Development Board has been moving in the direction of New York City. We have been bonding, we've been borrowing money for the State of Illinois to pay current operating expenses. Now if you want to stop that practice, if you want to sell bonds only for the purpose for which they were originally intended, then I urge an 'aye' vote on this issue. It's an important issue. It's one that might save the State of Illinois from going broke in the future and I think it's a very important matter."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have in my hand some material I asked the Comptroller's Office for yesterday and I would remind you that the state debt in Illinois has increase 372% since 1970. The per capita debt has gone from \$22.90 to \$127.50. Now, for God's sake, let's don't spend it for fences and window panes and things which won't last as long a bond issue and force this on your children and grandchildren. This is a responsible Amendment."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the items mentioned by Representative Rigney aren't the only items in a 25 year bond issue. We've just debated on this House floor removable items that the Mental Health Department needs for some of their edifices and the items we need in the Specialized Living Center edifices. With this type of an Amendment, if this is successful, those buildings won't be allowed to be opened and I don't think that is the intent of this type of an Amendment. I think what this is going to cause is outfits like Chapman and Cutler demanding from us a 25 year guarantee on any item which creates another form of insurance which is another cost to the taxpayer and this has got



hidden costs. I urge you to defeat this Amendment and you can do it with a Bill later on."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr.

Clerk. Mr. Schuneman, for what purpose..."

Schuneman: "Cancel it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "All right, Mr. Madison, for what purpose do you arise? Mr. Madison votes 'no'. On this question there are 79 'ayes' and 79 'nays'. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, arise?"

Walsh: "Just to ask you to recognize Representative Schuneman. I think he was seeking recognition."

Speaker Shea: "I thought he was. There are 79 'aye' votes and 79 'nay' votes and the Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With a tie vote; what's the posture of the Amendment?"

Speaker Shea: "It loses."

Schuneman: "Well, that being the case, Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully ask for a poll of the absentees and then a verification, please."

Speaker Shea: "All right, poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Selcke: "Boyle, Campbell, Capuzi, Craig, Domico, Ewell, Gaines."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Ewell. Mr. Ewell votes 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "Wall and that's it."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Giorgi, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, to expedite the movement of the House, I'll accept the Amendment rather than tie us up on a verification because I'm sure that there's a lot of other action that's going to take place that's going to, that's going to be back and debated and discussed again."

Speaker Shea: "On this question there are 80 'ayes' and 79 'nays' and the motion carries and the Amendment is adopted."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #4 was defeated in Committee. Committee Amendment #5, Mautino. Amends House Bill 3656 page 1, line 10 and so forth."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."



Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 deleted all the requested increases in bonding authorization with the exception of \$12,927,100 increase to the Division of Waterways. It included the projects of Busse Woods, Addison Creek, St. Joseph's Creek, Bensenville Ditch, Kingery Ditch, Wood River Improvement, Lake Depue, Pekin Parkway, Middle Fork Project, Harrisburg Raw Water Intake Structure, and Saline Valley Conservancy District. I move for its approval."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #5. Is there discussion? All those in favor of the Amendment will say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clark Selcke: "Amendment #6, Giorgi. Amends House Bill 3656 as amended and so forth."

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

Giorgi: "Amendment #6 increases the authorization for Conservation Department working in conjunction with local governments to acquire green areas and that matching fund basis and I urge your adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #6. Is there discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I know the Gentleman who is offering the Amendment doesn't usually like to talk about cost, but I wonder if he could tell us the total amount in the Amendment."

Giorgi: "\$5,000,000."

Skinner: "Thank you."

Giorgi: "Roll Call."

Speaker Shea: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield? What is this additional \$5,858,700 for?"

Speaker Shea: "Turn Mr. Giorgi on, please."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, it's to allow on a matching basis the state government in conjunction with local units of government to acquire



green areas, you know, for the future use of the populace.

Mr. Schlickman, I would respectfully suggest that you would consult with the staff if you're going to question the Amendment. I don't think we ought to be debating...going into the Bill on this stuff."

Schlickman: "Well, would you like to pull the Bill out of the record so I can do that?"

Giorgi: "No, sir. Why should I pull the Bill out? You have a full staff like we do."

Speaker Shea: "Is there further debate? Is there further debate? The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #6. All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #7, Giorgi. Amends House Bill 3656 as amended in the first sentence of Section 3 and so forth."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #7 puts in the money for the specialized living centers that we debated fully last Session and we've debated at many hours this Session and I urge the adoption of Amendment #7."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #7. Is there debate? Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I hate to be repititious, but I really do think that the Sponsor should the House... the House deserves to know how much it will cost, how much is to the total amount for, this Amendment?"

Speaker Shea: "How much is the dollar amount, Mr. Giorgi?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, the specialized living centers has been debated here maybe a thousand hours and the sum total is \$15,000,000 to provide centers. Every one of us knows that and I don't feel that we should... \$15,000,000."

Speaker Shea: "Is there further debate?"

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly apologize for not being one of the everyone that knows that."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #7."



All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #8, Young. Amends House Bill 3656 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Shea: "The Lady from St. Clair on Amendment #8."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #8 would increase the bond authorization by \$2,000,000 for the acquisition, development, and construction of site improvements and land for industrial park development and I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Shea: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #8.

Is there discussion? Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Shea: "She indicates she will."

Schlickman: "Aren't you attempting to obtain the same ends through this Amendment as you attempted to do yesterday on House Bill 3533, but were not successful?"

Young: "No, not at all. This Bill, this Amendment deals with bond authorization. The subject matter of 3533 is power to do an Act, so they're entirely different."

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

Speaker Shea: "Proceed, sir."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, yesterday afternoon we beat a Bill for the second time. It was taken off of consideration postponed and I specifically refer to House Bill 3544 or 3534 and 3533. And this Amendment is directly related to it. Now, the reason I think, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that 3533 and 3534 didn't succeed twice because a majority of this House realized that under the guise of the poor and under the guise of the need of a particular district, a rip-off of the state was being made to the tune of \$2,000,000 in 3% interest loans to industrial developers. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, for the same reason that 3533 and 3534 were defeated once, should have been defeated last



night, and in effect, practically were, that this Amendment should also be defeated and I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Shea: "The Lady from St. Clair, to close."

Young: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment would give the authorization for the bonding for the site improvements for an industrial park development and it is an important aspect of the whole business of building an industrial park in East St. Louis and I move its adoption."

Speaker Shea: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #8.

All in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, we need a Roll Call. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. All voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe we've passed today many of the same measures and I think Mrs. Young ought to have the same consideration in her Bill. I support an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 83 'ayes', 54 'nays', 1 Member voting 'present'. And Amendment #8 is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #9, Giorgi. Amends House Bill 3656 as amended on page 1 and so forth."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move to table Amendment #9."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves to table #9, Amendment #9. Is there objection? Hearing none, the Amendment is tabled."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #10, Totten. Amends House Bill 3656 as amended and so forth."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to table Amendment #10."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #10. Is there objection? Hearing none, the Amendment is ordered tabled. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #11, Leverenz. Amends House Bill 3656 and



so forth."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker, I move to table Amendment #11."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #11. Is there objection? Hearing none, the Amendment will be ordered tabled. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #12, Leverenz. Amends House Bill 3656 and so forth."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to hold that Amendment if we can. We'll table that Amendment also, Mr. Speaker. I move that it be tabled."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves to table the Amendment. Is there objection? Hearing none, the Amendment is tabled. Are there further Amendments? Third Reading. Now, in order to facilitate the Committee meetings this afternoon, there are some motions that will, if heard... Mr. Matijevich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, when Speaker Redmond was in the podium earlier, I had raised the point of order and I discussed it with Representative Walsh and he agreed with me that those motions on the Calendar relative to discharging Rules Committee are out of order and I discussed it with the Parliamentarian, too, and they also said that they are out of order and therefore, should be stricken from the Calendar. I now make that point."

Speaker Shea: "Well, I have a number of motions that I think, in the opinion of the Chair, should be called. They do not deal with Rules Committee. And unless... do you have a list, Mr. Matijevich?"

Matijevich: "Yeah, my list is House Bills 3794, 3982."

Speaker Shea: "Would you slow down a little bit, sir?"

Matijevich: "All right."

Speaker Shea: "Go ahead."

Matijevich: "3794, 3982, 3988, 3994, 3998, 4000, and Senate Bills 1525, 1651, 1750, and 2000, all which relate to discharging the Rules Committee being out of order."



Speaker Shea: "With leave of the House..."

Matijevich: "And 3650."

Speaker Shea: "With leave of the House, those motions will be taken from the Calendar. Now, Ms. Dyer, do you..."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to speak to this motion because I would like for this House to realize what we have done in this Session with the hope, I know that I'll not prevail on my protest in this Session, but I hope we'll never get ourselves in this spot again. Crises do develop in our state from the beginning of April to the beginning of July. No matter how we may try to limit our Sessions, very real crises do occur. I am speaking pertinent to House Bill 3988 which is one of those on Representative Matijevich's list. This Bill, Co-sponsored by Representative Willer and myself, seeks to help resolve a very real problem concerning the R.T.A. in the six county area. This is a problem that is... has developed during the spring and there is a real crisis for budget adoption in that Body. Now, under the rules we're now operating on, first, a Bill has to go to the Rules Committee. When the Chairman of the Rules Committee declined arbitrarily to hear any more House Bills in Rules Committee, that avenue was barred to Members..."

Speaker Shea: "Ms. Dyer, Ms. Dyer. Mr. Matijevich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Matijevich: "I make a point of order. All I did was raise a point of order and all I'm asking for is a ruling from the Chair and I believe her discussion on this is really out of order."

Speaker Shea: "Well, as I remember what happened and I will be corrected, there was a motion to strike from the order of motions all those motions dealing with the removal of Bills from the Rules Committee, is that right, Mr. Matijevich?"

Matijevich: "Well, in a way you're right except I did it as... via a point of order that because they are motions to discharge Committee they are really out of order. And I thought I did it the easier way to avoid this type of debate."

Speaker Shea: "Well, what I thought I might do so that... it has



been consistently the ruling of the Chair unless there has been unanimous consent, those motions could not be heard. Now, the Rules Committee is meeting after the noon recess. I'm going to call those motions at this point that deal with either meetings this afternoon or getting Bills to those meetings. And then we can take up those motions after the meeting of Rules today because I understand they are going to try to get all those Bills heard in Rules today and I would think that it would be better to come back after that meeting and that is going to be the intention of the Chair. Now, on the motions that are of some consequence now, Mr. Deavers. Is Mr. Deavers on the floor? Do you want to call your motion? The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen..."

Speaker Shea: "That's on his motions... I'm sorry, Mr. Deavers. That's to take House Bills 3664 through 3676 from the table and place on the order of House Bills, Second Reading. That motion takes 107 votes."

Deavers: "I understand that, sir; and this issue's been hotly debated. As you know the Labor and Commerce Committee labored long and hard. The Chairman was very fair and the fact that he allowed everybody to state their opinions in the whole thing but the one thing about that Committee, it suffers tremendously from what I call 'perceptual constancy'. That if it only, labor orientated, I feel that it should be brought to the Body. Everybody knows what's in the motion. They know what the 13 Bills do and I'd like to have a Roll Call vote on it."

Speaker Shea: "All right, the Gentleman has moved to take House Bills 3664 through 3676 from the table. The Chairman of the Committee on Labor. To take from the Speaker's Table, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think on this particular motion that we're somewhat spinning our wheels. Many of these Bills have already been presented to House Bill 3607. There is also a Senate Bill on Second Reading relative to Workmen's Compensation and I have already received 13 Amendments to that. And I would suggest that there is ample opportunity to



vote on Bills like Representative Deavers who's trying to strike the Committee for. And in order to save time, I would suggest that we vote this motion down. In the Committee, the vote on a do not pass as you can see from the Calendar was overwhelming and I would suggest to save time for the House that we should vote 'no' against this motion because there are other Amendments being presented to Workmen's Compensation Bills on Second Reading, both House Bills and Senate Bills. And I think if that's what you want to do, you should work on those Bills. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The question is... Mr. Walsh, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Walsh: "I rise, Mr. Speaker, to support the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Shea: "You cannot... Mr. Walsh, you're out of order. Mr. Lundy's motion carried this morning and on all motions we allow the person making the motion up to three and we allow on opponent up to three minutes. That's the end of the debate. We will then take a Roll Call. Now, Mr. Matijevich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I hope he doesn't get it, but in fairness to Representative Deavers under Rule 33(b), all it requires is 89 votes on this matter."

Speaker Shea: "My understanding of the rule is that you must file the motion within two days and call it within five, is that not it? Go ahead, Mr..."

Matijevich: "Well, I think what the rule says that it be called on the last day of the... by the last day of the subsequent week which he meets that criteria, I believe."

Speaker Shea: "I'll check the rule. While we're having that checked I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce to you Representative Tom Higgins, Chairman, the Iowa House of Representatives Human Resources Committee and welcome him to the State of Illinois. Tom."

Rep. Higgins: "Thank you very much. It's a pleasure to be here in as much as Springfield, Illinois happens to be my home town. And when I was a child, I used to come down here and sit up in that gallery and watch the deliberativeness of the Illinois



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

General Assembly. It was then that I decided that I'd never run for the Illinois General Assembly, so now I'm in Iowa. God speed."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Marovitz, for what purpose do you arise?"

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, I arise to make an announcement that House is privileged to have in the gallery one of the greatest ball players every to play Major League baseball, started with the New York Yankees and with the Chicago White Sox, a great soft-ball player, now working for the Secretary of State, next Governor, Mike Howlett, in the gallery, Moose Skowron."

Speaker Shea: "Now, the Parliamentarian informs... Mr.... the Minority Leader, Mr. Washburn."

Washburn: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know that your ruling or I believe your ruling was correct where we can't debate the issue on motions. However, are we permitted to arise and explain our vote in favor of Mr. Deaver's motion?"

Speaker Shea: "No, sir."

Washburn: "Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Now, in reading the rules again, I am informed unless somebody wants to take issue, that the motion was filed within two days and that he has until the end of the next Legislative week to call it which would put it within the rule and it will take 89 votes to take from the table, from the Speaker's Table. So, the Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Deavers, moves to take that series of Bills from the table. That motion has been resisted by Mr. Hill, Chairman of the Labor Committee. All those in favor of Mr. Deavers' motion will vote 'aye', those that wish to support Mr. Hill will vote 'no'. All voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Have all voted who wished? The record has been taken. On this question there are 85 'ayes', 67 'nays'. For which purpose does Mr. Deavers arise?"

Deavers: "At the proper time, I'd like to poll the absentees, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "We are at that time. Poll the absentees. There are now 86 votes 'aye' and 67 votes 'nay'. Schneider changes from



'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Luft. Luft votes 'aye'. Choate votes 'no'. Keller wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Birchler, for which purpose... Mr. Birchler wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. McGrew wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Mulcahey. I'm going to poll the absentees and those Members that are not on can then get recorded; and if anybody then wants to change, we can do that. All right, read the... poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Brummet, Campbell, Capuzi, Craig, Darrow."

Speaker Shea: "Darrow 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Downs, John Dunn."

Speaker Shea: "Wait a minute. Downs 'aye'. All right, proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "John Dunn."

Speaker Shea: "John Dunn 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Fleck, Hanahan, Kelly."

Speaker Shea: "Kelly 'no'. Did somebody say Hanahan 'aye'? All right, proceed with the..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kucharski, McGrew."

Speaker Shea: "McGrew voted 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Merlo, Mudd."

Speaker Shea: "Mudd 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mulcahey."

Speaker Shea: "Mulcahey 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schisler, Stone, Tipsword, VanDuynes, Wall, and Yourell."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Yourell. Mr. Yourell votes 'no'. Mr. Hanahan votes 'no'. Now, Mr. Sevcik, for what purpose do you arise, sir?"

Sevcik: "Mr. Speaker, may I be verified?"

Speaker Shea: "I don't know if anybody's requested verification yet."

Sevcik: "Well, I'm sure they are."

Speaker Shea: "Ms. Willer."

Willer: "I wish to change my 'no' vote to 'yes'."

Speaker Shea: "Ms. Will goes from 'no' to 'aye'. Will you give me the Roll Call now? At this time, there are 96 'ayes' and 69 'nos' and the Gentleman from... there are 96 'ayes' and 86 'nos' and the Gentleman's motion carries. On the order of motions is



Mr. Mulcahey's motion on House Bill 3951. Take that out of the record for a minute. All right, Ms. Barnes has a motion with regards to House Bill 3993. Do you wish to call that, Ms. Barnes?"

E.M. Barnes: "Take it out of the record please."

Speaker Shea: "Take it out of the record. All right, Mr. Mann, on 151, no. Mr. Skinner, is Mr. Skinner on the floor? On 875, do you want to go with that now?"

Skinner: "Is that the motion to take it out of Committee?"

Speaker Shea: "To discharge the Committee on Elections and advance to the Speaker's Table."

Skinner: "Yes, may I ask if the Elections Committee is going to meet again?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Laurino, is the Elections Committee going to meet again? Why don't you discuss that with Mr. Laurino and we'll take it out of the record. 920, Maragos. Do we want to call that now? Mr. Maragos, do you want to call 920 now? House Resolution 920."

Maragos: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution, Mr. Speaker, memorializes Congress regarding their attitude of not giving arms to an ally who fights another ally, especially Turkey who occupied a fellow NATO Member of Greece. This has been passed by many municipalities throughout the State of Illinois and throughout the country in other states and I will ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman asks leave of the House for immediate con... to waive that portion of the rules and allow immediate consideration. Is there objection? Is there objection?"

Mr. Katz objects. It takes 107 votes to suspend Rule 41(a) for immediate consideration. All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. The motion is for immediate consideration of House Resolution 920. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. It takes 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? This motion takes 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Have all voted who wished? On this, there are 99 'ayes' and 12



'nays', 9 Members... for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos, arise?"

Maragos: "I'd like to poll the absentees."

Speaker Shea: "Poll the absentees, will you, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce in the gallery on the Republican side the lovely wife of our colleague, Gene Hoffman, Diana Hoffman and also Gene's father, Wilbur Hoffman, sitting right up here."

Speaker Shea: "All right, poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson, E.M. Barnes."

Speaker Shea: "Barnes 'aye'. Mr. Davis 'aye'. All right, we'll catch 'em as we call 'em."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jane Barnes."

Speaker Shea: "Aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bluthardt, Boyle, Brinkmeier, Campbell, Capuzi, Carroll, Catania."

Speaker Shea: "Catania, where's Ms. Catania? 'Aye'. Did you wish to be recorded 'aye' or 'nay', Ms. Catania? 'No' for Ms. Catania."

Clerk O'Brien: "Collins, Craig, Cunningham, Daniels, Davis."

Speaker Shea: "Davis 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Deuster, Downs, Ralph Dunn, Fleck, Friedrich, Getty."

Speaker Shea: "Getty 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Griesheimer, Grotberg."

Speaker Shea: "Wait, let's stop right here for a minute. Mr. Schuneman wishes to go from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Ewing wishes to go from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Ebbesen wishes to go from 'no'... for what purpose do you arise, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question. When we memorialize Congress by Resolution to do anything, what's the disposition of the Resolution? Who gets it? What takes place?"

Speaker Shea: "My understanding is the Clerk of this House forwards it to the Clerk of the two Houses of Congress. Proceed with the



Roll Call. Proceed with the Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "J.D. Jones."

Speaker Shea: "Jones 'aye'. Now, Mr. Clerk, Mr. Madison, for what purpose do you arise?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, since there were 57 persons who were recorded as absent, wouldn't it be more expeditious to dump this Roll Call?"

Speaker Shea: "I will attempt, it looks like to take a new Roll Call. It's over 107 right now. On this... how many do we have now, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "107 'ayes' and 10 'nos'."

Speaker Shea: "Why don't we... Mr. Mann wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. All right, let's take a new Roll Call. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. There are 119, 120 'ayes', 9 'nays', 7 Members voting 'present' and the House suspends that portion of Rule 41 so that this motion may... or the Resolution may be heard. All right, Mr. Maragos, on the Resolution."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, thank you for allowing this to be considered immediately. The gist of the whole Resolution is that we memorialize Congress to have the U.S. government to exert its best effort to facilitate progress toward a just settlement of the Cyprus conflict and the removal of foreign troops from Cyprus and resolve that we strongly memorialize Congress to continue to support the new democracy in Greece. And that is the gist of the Resolution."

Speaker Shea: "Is there debate? Is there debate? All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Resolution carries. Simms, how do you wish to be recorded? On the order of motions appears 1533. Turn Mr. Davis' mike on for Geo-Karis on a point of personal privilege."

Geo-Karis: "On a point of personal privilege, I'd like to thank the Assembly for voting 'aye' because in two World Wars Turkey was playing footsie with Germany and I was very proud of the act



that Timothy Simms, whom I almost killed, was a Co-Sponsor of this Resolution."

Speaker Shea: "All right, is Mr. Leinenweber on the floor? Is Mr. Leinenweber on the floor? Mr. Sangmeister, do you want to handle those two Resolutions?"

Sangmeister: "Resolutions? I thought they were on motions."

Speaker Shea: "Or motions, I'm sorry. 1533 and 34."

Sangmeister: "Yes, what these are this is... there was some confusion as you can even see on the motions on the Calendar, there's four motions filed discharging the same Bills from two Committees and this is what happened. In the Judiciary I Committee and these are Bills pertaining to sale of property that is presently under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation Surplus Property. We've discussed this with Representative Washington and I understand he has no objection to this. Is that correct, Harold? And I will bring it out on the floor; if anybody's got any questions at that point, why they can. So, we would move for the discharge of the Committee."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman asks leave of the House to take Senate Bills 1533 and 1534 from the Committee on Judiciary I and place on the Calendar in the order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Is there objection? Is there objection? Hearing none, the Gentleman's motion will be adopted and the attendance Roll Call minus Mr. Katz' name will be used. Mr. Barnes, is E.M. Barnes or Mr. Kane on the floor? Mr. Stone, Mr. Schisler. Is Mr. Schisler here? On Senate Bill 1751, Mr. Schisler."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have filed a motion to discharge the Committee on Agriculture and advance to the order of Second Reading, Senate Bill 1571, 1751."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves to take Senate Bill 1751 from the Committee on Agriculture and place on the Calendar, Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Is there objection? Hearing none, the motion will be adopted with the attendance Roll Call minus Mr. Katz' name. Is Mr. Kane here? Is Mr. Kane... Mr. Kane, there's a series of Bills from the Treasurer of which you're the



Sponsor of one of 'em, but will you handle all three Bills? The Gentleman from... Senate Bill 1543. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1543. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, moves to take Senate Bills 1543, 1544, and 1545 from the Committee on Executive which is not meeting again and place on the Calendar. Do you want to tell the Ladies and Gentlemen of the House what the Bills do, Mr. Kane?"

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these three Bills are basically simple Bills to help the efficient operation of the Treasurer's Office and I would move that they be taken out of the Committee."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves to take those three Bills from the Committee and place on the Calendar in the order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Is there debate? Yes, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Of course, I was going to help Representative Giorgi. Those Bills and the Bill he had, Senate Bill 1851, all got involved and a little harangued one day and after that, I vowed I wouldn't hold another Committee meeting; but his has been rereferred to another Committee. But I wonder if we couldn't include his Bill in the discharge motion because then we would be treating all of those Bills that were in Exec. that day the same way."

Speaker Shea: "Well, we'll get back to that in one minute. These are these three Bills. Now, is there further debate? The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I don't want to raise an objection except that we're bypassing Committees here on Bills that have not been heard by Committee and I probably am going to vote to do it, but I'm just saying that they're merely Bills and so on and I've been around long enough to know that that's what turns me off. I'd like to know what they do."

Speaker Shea: "All right, Mr. Kane, would you again explain those three Bills."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, really they provide, for example, 1545 of which I'm most familiar with allows



the Treasurer to use New York banks for holding of securities for depository. It saves money, it saves the transfer of securities across state lines and there's no problems with it. All three Bills passed unanimously out of the Senate. There is no opposition. There was going to be no opposition in the Executive Committee and they got hung up on it... on a problem within the Committee."

Speaker Shea: "All right, the Gentleman asks leave to take those three Bills from the Committee on Executive and place on the order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Now, Mr. Walsh, do you want to speak to that motion?"

Walsh: "Yeah, I do. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that while I have no objection to these three Bills, that the procedure in this case would be a lot better if the Bills were, if the motion were to refer these Bills to the Committee on Assignment of Bills and they were assigned to a Committee that is still functioning. In this case, I suppose it's all right; but I would much prefer for other Bills that that be the procedure."

Speaker Shea: "Well, let us get these three Bills out of the way and then the other Bills we'll worry about as they come up. Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, the House Executive Committee was just about unanimously to send these Bills out. They were not controversial at all. It just happened that another Bill that wasn't controversial either but because of the Senate Sponsor that caused some harangue, then there was a quick adjournment. But the Committee was about unanimously to send these Bills out. There's no question about it and I think if you check with the Minority Spokesman, that was the case. So, these Bills would have been sent out unanimously and I support this motion to suspend."

Speaker Shea: "All right the Gentleman renews his motion. Is there objection? Hearing none, leave is granted and the attendance Roll Call will be used for the adoption of the motion minus Mr. Katz' name. Are there... let's see now, we've got... Mr. Giorgi wants to make a motion with regards to Bills and



it's in writing. The Gentleman's motion is pursuant to Rule 66(a). I move to discharge the Committee on Executive from further consideration of Senate Bill 1851, advanced to the order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Now on that, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this is also a Bill that came out of the Senate with a unanimous vote and all it has to do is with a land transfer between the County of Winnebago and the Department of Conservation in Winnebago. Mr. Simms and I have discussed it with leaderships on both sides of the aisle. There's nothing in this Bill other than it is a merely Bill. I think my motion should be corrected somewhat to take it out of the Environmental Protection Committee, rather than the Executive Committee."

Speaker Shea: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. Is there objection? Now, Mr. Friedrich, do you object, sir?"

Friedrich: "I wondered why he didn't have it put on the Second Legislative Day instead of First. I think he probably meant that. The motion as you read it, Mr. Speaker said, First Legislative Day."

Speaker Shea: "All right, the motion is Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Is there objection? All right, that will be adopted with the attendance Roll Call minus Mr. Katz' name. Now, back to Mr. Skinner's motion on... Mr. Skinner's motion on House Resolution 875 and turn the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, on."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I certainly don't want to burden the Elections Committee with another meeting since they aren't scheduling one, I wouldn't be. Since they aren't scheduling one, I would suggest... I would ask that we move on this motion to discharge the Committee. The Resolution in question if I may describe its contents recommends the Senate or reminds to the Senate that we passed Representative Choate's tremendous election reform Bill, House Bill 3091 which was the Elections Committee Bill that was the same as Representative Choate's House Bill 1111. It cites the... approximately two-thirds of the House who voted for the consolidation of elections Bill and it asks kindly that



the Senate join with us in this needed electoral reform without further delay. I would respectfully ask for the necessary majority to discharge Committee so we may consider that Resolution immediately."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino, the Chairman of the Elections Committee."

Laurino: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I urge the defeat of this motion simply because I don't think it's necessary to remind the Senate to consider any House Bill as long as it's had a mandate of at least three-fifths of this House to hear that Bill. The Gentleman has other avenues open to his choices as simply just walking over to the Senate and discussing this with the Sponsor in the Senate. The Minority Spokesman on the Elections Committee and myself have agreed that this is setting a precedent that should not even be considered, supposedly. So, I suggest that we defeat this motion with due haste. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "All right, the question is shall the Gentleman's motion be adopted. Requires 89 votes. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wishes? No, you cannot explain your vote. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this, there are 30 'ayes', 46 'nays', and the Gentleman's motion fails. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Choate. Or I mean, from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Well, I wasn't at my seat. I want to be recorded as voting 'aye' on this and I think that there's two or three others that does also."

Speaker Shea: "Well, the motion has already been marked failed."

Choate: "It wasn't announced was it?"

Speaker Shea: "Yes, sir. He can file another one. The Gentleman from..."

Choate: "Then inadvertently, I did vote on the prevailing side, did I not?"

Speaker Shea: "How is Mr. Choate recorded? You're recorded as voting 'no', sir."



Choate: "That's right. I would be in order, would I not, to reconsider the vote by which the Resolution lost, would I not? The motion lost."

Speaker Shea: "You would be, sir."

Choate: "Then I so move."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves to reconsider the vote by which the Resolution lost, the suspension of the rule. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer, for which purpose do you arise?"

Palmer: "Not on this, I'm sorry."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Kempiners, for what purpose do you arise?"

Kempiners: "I'd like to address this motion and explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. You know, this could get kind of ridiculous if the House is going to go through a lot parliamentary procedures to pass or at least reconsider a Resolution in asking the Senate to pass a House Bill which we sent over to it last year. We've got more important things to do during this Session than to pass Resolutions like this and to take the time of the House on motions such as this and I think that we ought to defeat this particular motion. And then we won't have to worry about setting a precedent for other busy times of the year."

Speaker Shea: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Union, arise?"

Choate: "Only to point out to Representative Kempiners that he probably took up more time in his dialogue than it would have taken to vote it."

Speaker Shea: "All right, this takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this there are 69 'ayes' and 25 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Now, the Gentleman from Winnebago... the Parliamentarian tells me that the motion takes 107 votes to suspend the rule. It is not on the motion. All right, now the Gentleman from Winnebago... Mr. Palmer for what purpose do you seek recognition, sir?"

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker, at the end, when you get through with this, I want to make a motion or pose a parliamentary question to you



after you've gotten through."

Speaker Shea: "We are ready to recess now."

Palmer: "Then I will state... I will ask for a point of parliamentary inquiry. And that has to do with the right of a Member of this House to get a quorum to hear a Bill for determination one way or another, to have his day in court. I understood the Speaker yesterday to indicate that if we had a House Bill, we could file the emergency petition and that it could be heard the following day. I did so, Mr. Speaker, in House Bill 3982. I do not see it on the Rules Calendar today. I followed what I thought was the directions of this House, of the Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "Well, I think that Mr. Katz when he announces the Rules Committee may have some House Bills on the request to be heard."

Palmer: "All right then, I'll withdraw."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Katz, do you want to make an announcement about Rules?"

Katz: "There is a meeting of the Rules Committee immediately upon the recess. We will begin a half an hour after the recess if the Members would please be there. Mr. Palmer did come over to me a minute ago and indicate that he had filed one of the requests are filed for an exemption of the Bill. I told him I would check with the Clerk of the Committee with regards to that. We have been continuously in deliberation since the moment he came over here a half hour ago. I don't know if the Clerk made a mistake. We do draw a deadline in terms of an agreement with the Republican Leadership and then we post so that everybody knows what's coming up. If you have a Senate Bill that you want to be heard, the procedure is to file a petition for exemption. Those are scheduled and are heard the following day. As far as Mr. Palmer's matter, I will check with the Clerk; but the Members of the House should be aware that on May 28 in a unanimous Resolution, announced on this House floor many, many times the Rules Committee did set a deadline so that we could be out of here in a calm and deliberate manner next week. Placing Bills on this floor three or four days before we adjourn is no service



to the Members of this House. It is no service to the people of Illinois and it is no service to our posture as being a deliberative Body. We are not trying to be arbitrary. Everyone had their chance to put in Bills. Mr. Palmer, as a matter of fact, had a hearing this week before the Judiciary II Committee with regard to the very subject he's talking about, an obscenity Bill. I failed to garner the necessary votes. In any event, Mr. Palmer, I will talk to the Clerk; but the Members of this House should be aware that on a totally bipartisan unanimous decision, the Rules Committee decided to put a cut off date so that we would not be flooded with Bills that the Members don't have adequate time to know what they're voting on. There will be a meeting of the Rules Committee a half hour after we recess here this morning today."

Speaker Shea: "Well, Mr. Katz, in order to alleviate this board of... that is about to explode from all those people that have filed petitions, I would assume that as Chairman and since there's no posting requirement seven days prior to the date of adjournment, June 30, you would hear those or at least..."

Katz: "Well, we have been hearing them..."

Speaker Shea: "Yeah, but you would have before you those House Bills that have petitions on, they would be in the Rules Committee. Is that right, sir?"

Katz: "We have one scheduled for today. I don't know about Mr. Palmer's, but the question of whether he filed the petition... we will hear the matter, Mr. Speaker. There was an agreement reached with the Republican Leadership. They wanted to know what was coming. It is a matter that is being handled between the Leadership so that everyone knows what is going on. We will try to accommodate Mr. Palmer, we have already accommodated another Member, but I have explained really. I'm repeating myself at this point and if any Member wants to come up, we'll talk about it. We'll have a Rules Committee meeting in a half hour."

Speaker Shea: "All right, those people with House Bills that filed petitions, if there's any question, see Mr. Katz. Now, on announcements, Mr. Garmisa."



Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to announce that the Transportation Committee meeting will be meeting at two o'clock in Room D1 and I would further like to ask the Speaker that or his permission that any Bills that are going to be assigned to Transportation that are in Rules now, I want to have the permission of the Speaker or the proper rule suspended to hear them in Transportation at two o'clock."

Speaker Shea: "I think your announcement covers that because there's no posting requirement for last week. Are there further announcements? Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Counties and Townships will meet in Room G4 which is on the second floor of the State Office Building on the north side promptly after adjournment. We have one Senate Bill to consider and there seems to be an agreement on this Bill, so if we all get there in time, we'll get out in a very short order. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've just been notified that the Assignment of Bills Committee has assigned Senate Bill 1572 to the House Committee on Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources. We will meet at two p.m. in Room A1 and I'll also consider at that time the House Resolution 898 introduced by Representative Meyer. Be there promptly at two p.m. and we hope to be through in a half an hour in Room A1."

Speaker Shea: "All right, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is to announce that the Revenue Committee will be meeting immediately after adjourn... recess, or adjournment, of the morning adjournment in Room 118. And among the other subjects which were announced last night is to be the subject matter of 3998 to be considered also in that Committee."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Barnes."

E.M. Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Appropriations II Committee will meet at 1:30, 1:30 in Room 118. Please be prompt. 1:30."

Speaker Shea: "Lechowicz."



Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Appropriations I Committee will meet on the House floor at 1:30. And if the attendance is... if we have enough for a quorum, we should be through in one hour. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Cities and Villages will meet promptly at 2:30 p.m. in Room 114. We have six Bills left, so I think your attendance is very necessary today."

Speaker Shea: "All right, Terzich. Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Personnel and Pensions Committee will meet in Room 122A at 1:30 in the Capitol Building. We have five Bills and we shouldn't be there too long."

Speaker Shea: "All right now, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "The Judiciary II Committee will be meeting at two p.m. today to hear the report of the Adult Corrections Subcommittee, chaired by Mr. Getty. That's two p.m. in Room C1 in the State Office Building."

Speaker Shea: "All right, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republican Members of the House Appropriations II Committee will meet in the Minority Leader's Office immediately following adjournment."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. LaFleur."

LaFleur: "Mr. Speaker, an inquiry. Mr. Maragos, the Chairman of Revenue, announced a meeting in 118 and also one of the Appropriations announced a meeting in 118."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Maragos, I guess, is meeting in 114."

Maragos: "I stand corrected, Mr. Speaker. It is 114, I apologize."

Speaker Shea: "Now, Mr. Palmer. Shut Mr. Palmer's light off, then, will you? Mr. Coffey."

Coffey: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 3951 which is on the order of motions, could you give me any idea when that would be called? It says sponsored by Representative Mulcahey and myself."

Speaker Shea: "Well, we tried to get there before, but we couldn't; but we'll get back to it. Mr. Jones."

J.D. Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like



leave to be voted 'aye' on House Bill, Senate Bill 1614. I was off the floor yesterday. It does not change the result."

Speaker Shea: "Does the Gentleman have Leave? Hearing no objection, the Gentleman will be so recorded. Now, Mr. Mulcahey, on 3951."

Mulcahey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 3951, I would move to discharge the Committee on Judiciary II and advance to the order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day, House Bill 3951; and I so move."

Speaker Shea: "Is there objection? Mr. Katz objects. Why don't we take that up... if you were required to get 107 votes now, Mr. Mulcahey, I think we ought to wait, don't you?"

Mulcahey: "That's a big 10.4, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "All right now, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, I have two stale motions on the... that are cluttering up the Calender in regard to House Bill 3998. I'd ask leave to table those motions."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman withdraws those two motions. All right, now Mr. Katz. All right, Mr. Katz' light is now shut off. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, removes his motion to recess until the hour of 3:30."

Giorgi: "3:30 today."

Speaker Shea: "All right, have you got the Agreed Resolutions there, Mr. Giorgi?"

Giorgi: "Why don't you let 'em go till later?"

Speaker Shea: "They tell me in the Clerk's Office that it takes a half hour and we can save it right now. Agreed Resolutions, Mr. Giorgi."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 936, VonBoeckman. 937, Mudd. 938, Choate. 940, Birchler."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 936 by VonBoeckman honors Hubert Entwisle on their 50th wedding anniversary. House Resolution 937 by Mudd honors the volunteers of the booth out in the rotunda. House Resolution 938 by Choate notes the Bicentennial by reenacting the George Rogers Clark conquest. House Resolution 940 by Birchler allows Accountancy Act Study Committee to report by December, 1976. I move for the Agreed



Resolutions."

Speaker Shea: "Is there objection? All those in... for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, arise?"

Schlickman: "Simply to respond to your inquiry if there was an objection and I raise an objection with respect to House Resolution 940."

Giorgi: "Why don't we take that out till later then?"

Speaker Shea: "All right, take that out."

Giorgi: "Birchler's Accountancy Act..."

Speaker Shea: "We'll go back to Mr. Birchler's Resolution in a moment."

Giorgi: "After the recess."

Speaker Shea: "All right, take 940 out. All those in favor of the Agreed Resolutions say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'; and the Gentleman's motion is adopted. Now, on further Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 935, Hill. 939, Giglio. 940, Birchler."

Speaker Shea: "All right, it takes 107 votes to suspend the appropriate rule for the immediate consideration of those Resolutions. And I'm thinking that the best procedure would be, would be to put those... lay them on the Speaker's Table and call them upon our return at 4:00 when we have the requisite bodies. 3:30 and they'll be on a Supplemental Calendar. All right, introductions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4002, C.M. Stiehl and Choate. A Bill for an Act to create the Coal Mine Substance Insurance Division. Third... First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Shea: "All right, now the Gentleman from Winnebago, renews his motion that the House stand in recess until 3:30. All those in favor 'aye', those opposed 'nay' and the House will be in recess until 3:30 o'clock, p.m. this afternoon."

House in recess

Doorkeeper: "All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery."

Speaker Bradley: "The Members will be in their seats and the House will come to order. Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Yourell, Chairman from the Committee



Counties and Townships, to which the following Bills were referred; action taken June 24, 1976. Reported the same back with the following recommendation, do pass, Senate Bill 1930. Representative Schneider, Chairman from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which the following Bills were referred; action taken June 24, 1976. Reported the same back with the following recommendation, do pass, Senate Bill 1871 and 1872."

Speaker Bradley: "On the Calendar on House Bills, Second Reading appears House Bill 3811. Mr. Stearney on the floor? House Bill 3907, Mr. Giorgi. Out of the record. House Bill 3935, Mr. Schneider. Out of the record. House Bills, Third Reading. On the Calendar appears House Bill 3535, Mrs. Younge."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 35..."

Speaker Bradley: "3533."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3533. A Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose the Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, arise?"

Schlickman: "Did you say, Third Reading or Consideration Postponed?"

Speaker Bradley: "It appears on House Bills, Third Reading as amended, 3533."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, these Bills were at the order of Consideration Postponed. Yesterday they were taken off the order of Consideration Postponed..."

Speaker Bradley: "No, sir, I believe that the Lady was given leave at... on Third Reading to take it out of the record. The same consideration was granted to, I think, a Bill by Mrs. Stiehl and it was... I think Representative Choate made that motion."

Schlickman: "Well, didn't those Bills come from the order of Consideration Postponed?"

Speaker Bradley: "No, they were on Third Reading at that time."

Schlickman: "You mean, yesterday was the second time she took it out of the record?"

Speaker Bradley: "I don't know that it's the second time or not but I know that she was granted leave to do that, so let's..."



continue.... Well, I think it was so shown by... it was put in the Journal that you objected if I recall. Let's see, let's continue with 3533. Mrs. Younge, the Lady from St. Clair."

Younge: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, may I have leave to present 3533 and 3534 at the same time?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady requests leave to hear 3533 and 3534 together. Are there any objections? Hearing none, we'll hear the two Bills at the same time. Has the other Bill been read a Third time?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3534. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Capital Development Board for the development of a progress plaza industrial park. Third Reading of the Bill."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 3533 and 3534 would commit an appropriation of \$1,900,000 from the Capital Development Fund for the development of an industrial park in the East St. Louis, Illinois area. The authorization would be to make a loan of these funds to the Regional Business and Economic Development Council for the development of progress plaza industrial park. The loan would be at a 3% interest rate. The loan would make available to the Regional Business Economic Development Council the requirements it needs to match a \$2,000,300 federal grant from the Department of Commerce to build site improvements for an industrial park. The federal grant is for 70% of the site improvements and the state matching share would be for the 30% plus, the funds needed for land acquisition. The land would continue to be owned by the Capital Development Board until it had been paid for by the Regional Business, Economic Growth Council. This project is urgently needed by my district and I move for your favorable consideration of this matter."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think before anything else in this regard, we ought go into what happened last night. Mrs. Stiehl had a Bill which if you will recall passed. The vote by which it passed was reconsidered and the Bill returned to the order of Postponed Consideration. Mrs. Stiehl thereupon asked to have it, that Bill, taken out of the record



and not called which was a perfectly proper request, one that has been traditionally granted by the Speaker. Now Mrs. Younge, thereafter, called this Bill and we after considerable debate got into a Roll Call and explanation of vote and it was apparent that Mrs. Younge was not going to get sufficient votes to pass the Bill, she then asked to take the Bill out of the record. And, Mr. Speaker, that's the first time in ten years that I can recall that a Speaker permitted someone to take a Bill out of the record where the Roll Call had been started. The Speaker last night was a little bit testy and would not discuss the matter on the floor. I hope he's back..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Kane: "Point of order. I think that this was discussed and the Speaker ruled on this last night and if the Gentlemen disagree, he has a motion that he can make. Otherwise, I think we ought to proceed."

Speaker Bradley: "I think your point's well taken and let's confine our remarks to 3533 and 3534."

Walsh: "The point I make, Mr. Speaker, is that it was not discussed and that will be the end of that as far as I'm concerned. Now to talk a bit about the Bill. This was, of course, vetoed, this matter vetoed very properly by Governor Walker and we properly did not override the veto last November. The Bill calls for the expenditure of almost \$2,000,000, now the issuance of \$2,000,000 in bonds now and because of the low interest rate that would be charged the people getting the benefit of this bond money, the cost to the state would be in the area of a half a million dollars a year just for interest. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is more for this project than for any other single project for industrial development that has ever been undertaken in the State of Illinois and I suggest to you that we are not in a position, this is not going to be significant in the area of creating new jobs or losing present jobs. What might be significant, Mr. Speaker, the people on that side of the aisle refuse to address themselves to..."



Speaker Bradley: "Could you wait... I'd like to get you some order, sir. Would you give the Gentleman some order, please?"

Walsh: "I'm not sure I'd know what to do with it, Mr. Speaker.

What might be significant is changes, significant changes in the Unemployment Compensation and Workmen's Compensation Act. That's what we should be addressing ourselves to in order to save jobs in this state and to prevent the necessity, Mr. Speaker, for an increase in taxes which this Bill and others like it certainly will do, so I would urge that you vote 'no' on this Bill."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, there have been two Bills or two series of Bills that we've heard this year which I would like to compare. The Chicago Port District and Representative Younge's progress park. Now in the Chicago pork... port... I keep getting port and pork mixed up here for some reason. In the Chicago Port District, the district is not required to pay any interest on the money that the state is going to pledge its full faith and credit to. On Representative Younge's Bill, they're going to pay, the local people are going to pay 3% interest in addition to the principle. Now that is the significant difference and it seems to me that it is indicative of how tight this Bill is after having gone through God knows how many Committees over the last year and a half. I could concoct a reason to vote against this Bill, but I doubt that anyone who voted for the Chicago Port District could do so in good conscience. So I would hope that it would be passed."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I'm rising for an announcement, but I'll wait until we finish consideration of the Bill if you wish."

Speaker Bradley: "Fine, sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Miller."

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

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates that she will."

Miller: "Mrs. Younge, is there any federal funding of the project that you're introducing?"

Younge: "Yes, there is, Representative Miller. The Regional Business and Economic Development Council has available a \$2,300,000



federal grant to 70% of the site improvement for this industrial park."

Miller: "As part of the federal program, do they require a local match of money?"

Younge: "Yes, they did."

Miller: "Is it your intent that the local match be achieved by state funding?"

Younge: "That is my request."

Miller: "All right, Mr. Speaker, may I address myself to the Bill, please?"

Speaker Bradley: "You certainly may, sir."

Miller: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to oppose this Bill for four reasons. Number one, there is not local money whatsoever going into this program. The federal match will be made by state money. Number two, in the Bill, in one of the two Bills, it specifies that the state will turn the property over to the local organization by deed. This property then would be held by title or deed in private hands. If they do not make good their restitution of paying back the bonds, they've got the property, they don't have any responsibility for paying back the money; and they're left holding a pretty good piece of land. Number three, I oppose it because for the first time in Illinois we would be opening the door for the Capital Development Board to be funding private industrial parks. It's unheard of for the State of Illinois in any other area to be funding private programs. And number four, the project is limited by the amount of the appropriation to one local program and I don't think if we're going to get into funding private industrial parks, we ought to limit it to one specific area. I encourage your 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge, to close."

Younge: "I think that this Bill has been greatly strengthened by the Committee process. The land would continue to be owned by the Capital Development Board until it is paid for. I think that it is strengthened by the fact that the loan would be at a 3% interest rate and that it would be paid back by the Regional



Business Economic Development Council which is a Council made up of the private banking and the Regional Growth Association and those persons who have available the industries who locate in this park. I have pursued this matter because I am absolutely certain that it can make a big difference in the East St. Louis unemployment picture. We have the very great benefit of having the total cooperation of the business and banking community in our area. And I think that it would be the most important thing that could happen to my district and I urge your support of this very vital legislation."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is shall these Bills pass. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis, to explain his vote."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a pressing and impressive duty which I assume in asking to explain my vote. I can remember full well after World War II that \$20,000,000,000 that this nation spent to revitalize Europe. I can remember full well when it was devastated, bombed out, buildings destroyed. I can remember the Marshall Plan and all of you do. I don't know why we are so excited when the Lady comes in to ask you to help at home. If there ever was an area that needed it, it's the area from which... that this Lady represents. It's in dire need. You pick up your papers now and every travel agency, you will see invitations upon invitations to come to Europe. It has been revitalized. It's practically a garden of roses and why? It was revitalized with our money. That's how it was revitalized. I know that the \$20,000,000,000 that they spent on the Marshall Plan, if they had to do the same thing now, I know that it would cost them perhaps \$40,000,000,000, maybe \$50,000,000,000. But I'm asking you why we won't do something about our own cities. This is a great opportunity now. You say you want to help. This is a great opportunity to do something at home and there's an old adage that charity begins at home. Save our own cities like you saved Europe after World War II. Save our own cities. Save East St. Louis. The men from that town who went to Europe to



fight and die for this nation. Now they can't even live for it in that territory down there. I plead with you, I beg you to give us enough votes to pass this Bill. The federal government is going to match the funds. Talk about \$2,000,000,000, \$2,000,000,000 isn't near \$20,000,000,000 what they spent to revitalize another country and you don't want to spend one dime to revitalize your own cities. God help us. What are we going to come to if we see our cities literally destroyed. Our men walk in the street unemployed and you won't even vote to go give a helping hand. I beg you, I plead with you pass this Bill, who as much love and concern for this country as you've shown for the foreign nations, as you've shown to beautify your... and to make it an object of beauty so much so that your travel agents are inviting all of us to go. If you want me to sit, give it 89 votes."

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

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to say 'Amen' to everything the previous speaker said and also beseech each and every Member in this House to give some real consideration to what Representative Younger is trying to do. Everybody knows, I'm sure, that East St. Louis is a very depressed area and just recalling not so many days ago, we were all agonizing over the House Bill 3475 which was Public Aid's Bill, two billion, some odd million. If we're ever going to reduce that, I think this is the proper way to do it. What these people are asking for is a chance to break the yoke of Public Aid and the only way to do it is the way that she's proceeding to do. We're asking to break that dependency and become vibrant, viable people down in that area. I don't think that's too much to ask for. Already outlined that there... the safeguards that are necessary to see that this project doesn't become a fiasco are all there. There's matching funds with federal guarantees. I urge each and every Member to give this some real consideration and some more green lights. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, not to explain my vote, but we've been moving



111.

along very well this year, or this particular day and I would ask the Speaker if he would enforce the rules that we've set up on explanation of vote so we can continue to move along in an expeditious manner."

Speaker Bradley: "We will start using the clock, sir."

Hoffman: "Thank you, sir."

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

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not going to take over a minute, but I'd like to call some of my good Republican colleagues to show that they mean it when they say they're interested in private enterprise. The government has a lot of boondoggles, a lot of other things that you criticize; but here is a community that wants to encourage private enterprise to come in and assume the responsibility for improving the economic climate. Therefore, I'm asking Arthur Telcser to turn green."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington, to explain his... the Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart, explain your vote, sir."

Hart: "No, not at this time. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Miller. For what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Miller: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask for a verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman has requested verification.

Mrs. Younge requests a poll of the absentees. Is that correct? The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk Selcke: "Boyle, Campbell, Capuzi, Coffey, Craig, Deavers."

Speaker Bradley: "Deavers wishes to be recorded as out of the left field bull pen voting 'no'."

Clerk Selcke: "Duff, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Epton, Ewing, Greiman, Hirschfeld, Hudson, Katz, Lauer, Leverenz, Lundy, McClain, Meyer, Peters, Pierce, Rose, Schoeberlein, Simms, Wall, Winchester, Mr. Speaker."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, before we begin the verification, I would like to introduce the Mayor of Ottawa, Illinois who is seated in the rear gallery. That's Jim Thomas. He's the Mayor of Ottawa, Illinois and he'll be the next Democratic State Senator from the 38th District. Jim Thomas."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg. What purpose do you rise, sir?"

Grotberg: "I think a point of personal privilege should be indulged here with my good friend Jim Thomas; but to introduce him as the next Senator, is just a little bit too far. How are you, Jim?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

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

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

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman's recorded as being absent."

Pierce: "Please vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Mr. Simms, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Simms: "Would you please vote me 'no'?"

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Simms as voting 'no'. Right now... the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Miller, the total is 98 'ayes', 45 'nays', 48 'nays', I'm sorry. Do you wish to proceed, sir, with verification?"

Miller: "Yes, I do for a moment or two to see how we fare, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, we'll call the affirmative Roll then, sir."

Clerk Selcke: "Arnell, E.M. Barnes, Beatty, Beaupre, Berman, Birchler, Jerry Bradley, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Capparelli, Catania, Chapman, Choate, Cunningham, Darrow, Davis, DiPrima, Domico, Downs, Dyer, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Gaines, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Giglio, Giorgi, Hanahan, Hart, Hill, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Huff, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Dave Jones, Keller, Kelly, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, LaFleur, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leon, Londrigan, Lucco."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose the Gentleman from Quincy,



Mr. McClain, arise?"

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe I'm recorded.

Would you vote me 'aye', please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Hudson: "I don't think I'm recorded either. Would you vote me 'no', please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Hudson as voting 'no'."

Clerk Selcke: "Luft, Madigan, Madison, Mann, Maragos, Marovitz, Matijevich, Mautino, McAvoy, McClain, McGrew, McLendon, McPartlin, Merlo, Molloy, Mudd, Nardulli, Neff, O'Daniel, Patrick, Pierce, Pouncey, Randolph, Riccolo, Richmond, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Sharp, Shea, Skinner, E.G. Steele, Cissy Stiehl, Stone, Stubblefield, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Tipsword, Vitek, VonBoeckman, Waddell, Washington, White, Willer, Williams, Wolf, Younge, Yourell."

Speaker Bradley: "Questions, Mr. Miller, of the affirmative vote?"

Miller: "Arnell."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Arnell."

Miller: "Beatty."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Miller, before we start. We've got 99 'ayes', 49 'nays'. Mr. Arnell you requested. Is Mr. Arnell in the chambers? Mr. Arnell. He's in his seat."

Miller: "Beatty."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Beatty's in his seat."

Miller: "Berman."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Berman is not in his seat. Is he in the chambers? Take him off the Roll. How's he recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Aye."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Miller: "Brandt."

Speaker Bradley: "Who, sir?"

Miller: "Brandt."

Speaker Bradley: "Brandt, he's not in his seat. Is Mr. Brandt on the floor? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Aye."



Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll and the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Miller: "Brinkmeier."

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

Miller: "Brummet."

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

Miller: "Byers."

Speaker Bradley: "Byers is in his seat."

Miller: "Darrow."

Speaker Bradley: "Darrow is in his seat."

Miller: "Downs, Downs."

Speaker Bradley: "Downs? He's not in his seat. How's... he's in the aisle. Now, just a minute. Mr. Berman has returned to the chambers. Put him back on the Roll. Now, just... what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis, arise?"

Davis: "The Gentleman's asked to verify the Roll and what has happened? He didn't ask for a Roll Call, but this is exactly what he's doing. He's calling the Roll instead of verifying it. I tell you men died in East St. Louis to save your... and you've spent \$20,000,000,000. This is why you have trouble in your streets. You're unfair in calling the Roll. That's exactly what you're doing and you know you are."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed with the... any further questions, Mr. Miller?"

Miller: "Dyer."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Dyer. She's on the floor."

Miller: "Farley."

Speaker Bradley: "Farley? Farley is standing behind his seat."

Miller: "Flinn."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Flinn is not in his seat. Is he on the floor? He's not... how's he recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Aye."

Speaker Bradley: "Take Mr. Flinn off the Roll."

Miller: "Garmisa."

Speaker Bradley: "Garmisa is not in his seat. Is he in the chambers? He's back by Mr. Farley."



Miller: "Hanahan."

Speaker Bradley: "Hanahan, he's back there in his seat."

Miller: "Dan Houlihan."

Speaker Bradley: "Danny Houlihan is not in his seat. Is he in the chambers? Is the Gentleman... how's he recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Aye."

Speaker Bradley: "Take... here he is. He's here."

Miller: "Jaffe."

Speaker Bradley: "Jaffe is not in his seat. Is he in the chambers? There's Jaffe. Ann Willer's seat. No, well whoever. He's in the chambers, sir."

Miller: "Davé Jones."

Speaker Bradley: "Davis Jones in his chair."

Miller: "Keller."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Keller is not in his chair. Is he in the chambers? How's he recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Aye."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Miller: "Kosinski."

Speaker Bradley: "Kosinski. He's in his chair."

Miller: "Laurino."

Speaker Bradley: "Laurino is in his chair and Mr. Keller has returned to the chambers, sir. Put him back on the Roll."

Miller: "Leon."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Leon is in his seat."

Miller: "Maragos."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Here he is. He's in the chambers. Mr. Brandt has returned to the chambers. Put him back on the Roll."

Miller: "Matijevich."

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

Miller: "McPartlin."

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



Clerk Selcke: "Aye."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll and for what purpose does the Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Sharp, arise?"

Sharp: "Could I have leave to be verified? I've got someone outside."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Miller, can he have leave? The Gentleman has leave."

Miller: "Mudd."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Mudd. He's not in his seat that I can see. Is he in the chambers? How's he recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Aye."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Miller: "Merlo."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Merlo is in the chambers."

Miller: "Schisler."

Speaker Bradley: "Schisler is in his seat."

Miller: "Cissy Stiehl."

Speaker Bradley: "Cissy Stiehl is not in her seat. Is she in the chambers? How's she recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Aye."

Speaker Bradley: "Here she comes now in the rear of the chambers. Cissy, would you walk up there so Mr. Miller can see you?"

Miller: "We have a post between here and Jimmy Taylor. Is he there?"

Speaker Bradley: "Jimmy Taylor is there."

Miller: "LaFleur."

Speaker Bradley: "LaFleur. Is he back there? I don't see him in his seat. Is he in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Aye."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Miller: "Telcser."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Telcser. I can't... he's on the right side. He's over in the Democratic side."

Miller: "Terzich."

Speaker Bradley: "Terzich is right here by Mr. Kosinski."

Miller: "Waddell."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Waddell. I can't see if he's there or not. Is he in his seat? He's not there. Is he in the chambers?"



How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Aye."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll and put Mr. LaFleur... you'd better come up and let Mr. Miller see you, Mr. LaFleur. Take Mr. Waddell off and put... and take... put Mr. LaFleur back on."

Miller: "Williams."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Williams. He's not in his seat.

Is he in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "Aye."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Miller: "Willer."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon, sir."

Miller: "Ann Willer."

Speaker Bradley: "She's not in her chair. Is... she's over on the Democratic side, sir. She's in the chamber next to Mr. Matijevich."

Miller: "Wolf."

Speaker Bradley: "Wolf is in his seat."

Miller: "Davis."

Speaker Bradley: "I think he's here. On this question, on these two questions there are 95 'ayes', 49 'nays'; and these two Bills having received the Constitutional majority... for what purpose the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraedel, arise?"

Schraeder: "I hit the wrong button. I want to be recorded green."

(cont on next page)



Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as green. It makes it 96 'ayes', 49 'nos' and the Bill having received the Constitutional, these Bills having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the Calendar under Senate Bills, Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1967."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1967. A Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amends Senate Bill 1967 on page 16 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a Committee Amendment that was adopted..."

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute, Mr. Hill. Could we have some order please? This is one of the more important pieces of legislation that we'll be facing. Give the Gentleman some order, please."

Hill: "This Amendment was adopted in Committee. It was Committee Amendment #1 and what it does, it takes the... on page 16, by deleting lines 1 through 9 and that is the Section where the hearing standards were set up. It was all-encompassing in the Senate Bill and it not only covered hearing, but it covered all the areas of Workmen's Compensation and I would move for the adoption of Committee Amendment #1."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Committee Amendment #1. Any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor of the Amendment, say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #2, Walsh-Deavers. Amends Senate Bill 1967 page 1, line 6 by inserting 'l' between Sections and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook or McLean is going to handle the... the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, on Amendment #2."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Amendment that was adopted on House Bill 3707 dealing with the term 'activities' in the Workmen's Compensation Act."



Originally, Workmen's Compensation was designed to apply only to full-time business enterprises. The introduction of the term 'activities' into the definition of these organizations that must be covered by Workmen's Compensation has made the definition too broad. Now organizations such as the Elks Club or the American Legion who use volunteer workers to build floats for a parade or a private individual who hires a neighbor boy to mow his lawn could be covered under the wording of the Act. And as we discussed at some length the other day, Mr. Speaker, the second part of this, the fact that a boy who was hired to mow your lawn is required to be covered by Workmen's Compensation would mean that the typical comprehensive personal liability policy or that section dealing with personal liability of a homeowner's or tenant's insurance policy, would not apply because within those policies for liability coverage, there is a specific exclusion where the activity is covered by Workmen's Compensation, the Workmen's Compensation Act. So, I submit to you that if you do not, do not adopt this Amendment and the Act stays as it is, then we let the insurance companies off with probably the greatest exposure they have under the personal liability section and we, on the other hand, leave the homeowner or the tenant absolutely in jeopardy of tremendous Workmen's Compensation suits where he does not have coverage. He thinks he has coverage under his personal liability policy, but does not have coverage. And I urge the adoption of Amendment #2."

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

Hanahan: "Will the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Walsh: "Yes."

Hanahan: "Representative Walsh, I know that you're not a member of the Bar and maybe you may want some legal advice on the answer to this question, so, before you answer it, I'd like the Membership to know that it's a rational question of everyday happenings and what this Amendment that you're offering, may indicate. If you hired, if you hired a person to mow your lawn, would they be covered under this Act right now, the 1975 Act?"



Walsh: "Well, the opinions that I have are that they very well could be and one of the problems here and this is within the use of the term 'activities', they very well could under this..."

Hanahan: "Mr. Walsh, I wish before you'd answer that, that you'd check with your legal counsel. You'll find that they'd have to work 40 hours..."

Walsh: "Mr. Hanahan, my counsel's standing right here to my right. He said I'm right."

Hanahan: "I would ask him to look up the law then to see if they would be covered. That in order to be covered you must work 13 weeks, 40 hours a week, is that correct, Mr. Walsh?"

Walsh: "That is incorrect, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "That's your best legal advice?"

Walsh: "Yes, sir."

Hanahan: "Okay, that a person mowing the lawn would be covered?"

Walsh: "Well, could be, yes. He could be."

Hanahan: "Okay."

Walsh: "This is a part of the great gray area that was in the Bill that you sponsored or..."

Hanahan: "Okay, now, one other question and then I'll address myself to the Amendment. If this young man or young woman who is hired to cut your grass lost a foot on your property after you hired them to cut your grass, are you or are you not liable for that person's return or that person's welfare under the law today in Illinois?"

Walsh: "To begin with, the circumstances would dictate whether or not I was liable; but in any case, I would be covered against that liability by my insurance carrier, the carrier that handles my comprehensive, personal liability or homeowner's policy. Now, for the medical payments, there is also a medical payment section within that and there's no consideration within that medical payment section of who is to blame. They simply pay for the repair of the boy's foot or arm or hand or whatever."

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

R.K. Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was rising to help our



Representative, Bill Walsh, relative to the rhetorical reply."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Walsh, do you want help from Mr. Hoffman?"

Walsh: "I'll take all the help I can get."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hoffman, continue."

R.K. Hoffman: "I think the question that was asked by the Representative from the other side of aisle was rather obvious. Number 1, it's not within Representative Walsh's purview to answer who is responsible; but more so, as he was responding to the fact that the insurance company would determine then, number 1, the liability, the responsibility, and certainly to compensate for the damage done."

Hanahan: "All right, well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, addressing myself to the Amendment. One of the things that bothers me is the cockeyed idea that by having Workmen's Compensation coverage by law expanding it to all types of occupations, including activities outside of industrial, mercantile type of establishments, that somehow, we're forcing upon the people something bad. If you go back to the true story of why we have Workmen's Compensation Laws, it's employer benefit. This Amendment denies or tries to deny that applicability to people who could be construed as employer and denies to them the opportunity, truly, to be protected against the types of lawsuits that would hold them liable with no limitation on the amount of money that they would be liable in a court of law. Now, my understanding of the word 'activities' would include that kind of person employed for 13 weeks, 40 hours a week for minimum coverage under the language of the existing statute. An occasional hired babysitter or an occasional hired grass cutter would not be covered under the provisions of the 1975 Act as I read it. Now, that once again could be construed that the Industrial Commission makes the final determination, not the insurance companies on a claim in an Industrial Commission hearing. But the fact remains that that injured person is who we're worried about, that injured person who may have to end up on welfare for the loss of an arm, loss of an eye, the loss of a leg or foot; that may have fallen off



a roof while cleaning the gutter or cut off a hand while cleaning leaves underneath a lawnmower. What happens to that person if you didn't have the wisdom to cover yourself with insurance? And, Mr. Walsh says about... excuse me, the Minority Leader says that, you know, we're doing something bad by covering activities. Well, I say just the opposite. He advocates the fact of liability insurance on a home. I know many home owners that do not have liability insurance. What happens to that injured worker in that case? Not every homeowner or renter carries liability insurance. What happens in that case when a person is injured while performing a service for you? I just suggest that we have to get to the basic understanding of what is Workmen's compensation, why do we carry it, and why does it protect the employer and what limits the injured person from the recovery to certain degrees. That's what it's all about and as long as we have the law, let me explain that I think it's foolish that we don't encourage people to carry that kind of insurance, like we encourage 'em through a Financial Responsibility Act to cover themselves on automobile collision and automobile public damage. Same concept here, we want people to carry that kind of insurance so that that employee if an injury occurs, that if at that time that injury occurred, will have some recourse in an Industrial Commission to have some recovery to take care of 'em and not be placed on the backs of the taxpayers through public welfare and public aid. Now, that is the alternative to an injured person, a person who loses their eyesight or their hands or their feet. One person, under this Amendment, would be placed under the care of the Public Aid Department which means all the taxpayers would be paying for it. The other case would be coverage under an insurance company that in that type of employment it would cost a grand total of \$36 a year at maximum. I think it's a bad Amendment and should be defeated."

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

Duff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen."



of the House, I have tremendous respect for the ability of the previous speaker to address himself to the problems of organized labor. But I would gently as I can correct a misapprehension or a misunderstanding that he has and has suggested to the floor on two premises. First of all, prior to the enactment of Workmen's Compensation legislation at the beginning of this century, the employer had available to him two common law defenses. One was called the master-servant relationship and the other was assumption of risk. The principle of Workmen's Compensation was first, to deprive the employer of those two common law protections and in return for depriving him of those two protections, there was a limitation placed upon the amount of statutory recovery that the employee could have. There was a very real need for this in society at that time as the result of the Industrial Revolution and mass production in this country. But it was never designed, Workmen's Compensation legislation was never designed to be a protection of the employer. In fact, it was designed to provide a reasonable basis upon which the employer would lose his common law defenses. Now, the reason that becomes important to the Amendment of Representative Walsh is this. If you are dealing on a common employee-employer or, if you will, in the old common law master-servant relationship, then you can see the necessity for the social agreement, if you will, of Workmen's Compensation. On the other hand, if you are dealing with the occasional contractor, in effect, the person who agrees to perform a task for a fee without any of the other privileges and benefits that go with employment today, such as vacation time, sick leave, retirement benefits, pensions and all of the things related to employment, then you realize you are dealing with a contractor. Now, where that comes into play is that if you hired somebody to cut your grass or to clean your gutters, you have available not the master-servant or the common law defenses of assumption of risk, but those of a property owner and you do have coverage under your homeowners or personal liability policy. That is very important to you, even if you haven't done



wrong because those policies include the cost of defense. Defense, as you all know, can run into enormous amounts of money for the typical taxpayer, homeowner or tenant in a building. Without Representative Walsh's Amendment, you are taking the risk of not having that personal liability policy applied to those minor contractual relationships that everyone of us has in the normal course of running a home. And you are not successfully allowing the Workmen's Compensation laws to apply unless you will require every one of those homeowners to also buy a Workmen's Compensation policy. Now, I would suggest that if that occasion should arise, you're going to see an uproar from the landholders, the property owners, the tenants in this state the like of which you've never seen. Without Representative Walsh's Amendment, we are in a no man's land in the courts today. It's reasonable and really should be adopted."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, to close."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think Representative Duff did a scholarly job in explaining the need for this Amendment. Just to elaborate a bit more, there is a specific exclusion within the liability policy, the personal liability policy that almost all of us have wherein it excludes activities covered by the Workmen's Compansion laws. So the fact is that there isn't coverage if, if the activity is under that Act. Now, I submit to you and I think the Gentleman from McHenry, knows this that there are several categories, some 18 or 19, that within the Workmen's Compensation Act, that do not require that it be working full-time, in effect. There are such things as doing work on roofs or dealing with scythes and many other activities that do not fit that definition. So, Mr. Speaker, there is at least considerable doubt in this matter



and I would urge that we adopt this Amendment or, as Representative Duff said, there will be an uproar the likes of which you have never heard if we require that every single homeowner and apartment dweller have a Workmen's Compensation insurance policy. And finally, Mr. Speaker, there is only one group that benefits from the Act in its present form and that's the insurance companies who sell comprehensive, personal liability policies because by not adopting this Amendment, we exclude a great portion of the risks that they have under these policies. I urge the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1967. All those in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. All those will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Hill, to... the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill, to explain his vote."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, again, Representative Walsh with his Amendments is trying to confuse the issue. I feel very confident that this particular area that he's discussing is already covered under liability insurance and he's intimating that it would be covered under Workmen's Compensation insurance. I fully understand that the insurance companies are trying to do this because they're having a very difficult time explaining to their customers that the liability insurance is going up and they can't explain why it's going up. I've received letters to this effect, people complaining about it, but I'd like to point out to you that this is a proper area for it. And I'd appreciate very much a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 87 'ayes' and 68 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #3, Walsh. Amends Senate Bill 1967 on page 35 by deleting lines 18 through 24 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Skinner: "To ask leave of the House not to have 140 page Amendment that



does nothing but change the word 'workmen's' to 'worker' printed. Amendment #21 and if we have to put them through this torture to print the thing, we ought to get 'em started now. But it does nothing but change... it's sponsored by, jointly by Representative Hanahan and myself. This is the no-sex Amendment of the Session."

Speaker Bradley: "I think this is one time we could save the state some money. Are there any objections to the Gentleman asking that we not print the Bill. It has how many, the Amendment that has how many pages, sir?"

Skinner: "There are approximately 140."

Speaker Bradley: "For the benefit of only changing one word, have leave? Leave being granted..."

Skinner: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Hearing no objection, leave is granted. All right, Mr. Walsh, on Amendment #3."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 states that instead of immediately fining an employer who the Industrial Commission feels is guilty of practicing delay or negligence in the payment of Workmen's Compensation benefits as the present Act provides and as the Act before amended a year ago did not provide, it requires that the Industrial Commission send a letter within three days to the employer, notifying him of his failure to pay benefits and within five days, levying the fine on him if he does not comply. Very frequently, the difficulty in the payment of claims lies with the insurance company, of course; and not with the employer. The employer is powerless to do anything about it but call his insurance company and get them off the dime. And so, there's really no reason to fine the employer. There is to fine the insurance company, so I would urge the adoption of Amendment #3. It doesn't amount to very much but is somewhat important."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill, on Amendment #3."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I only wish that Representative Walsh could work in a factory like I have to work in



when we're not in Session and find out the safety hazards that we have to contend with. I'd like to point out to him that this piece of legislation, the way it is drawn, without his Amendment has the effect that the business people when an infraction of some safety hazard is brought to their attention, they will correct it. I'd like to point out to you that it's very difficult sometimes to get those people to correct these issues. And I'm sure that if this Amendment is not adopted, in the long run, it's going to save many miseries of families and employees being hurt in factories because they look at this and consequently say, that it will cost us less money to fix it up than it will to fight a Workmen's Compensation case. Consequently, someone then will not be injured in the future. I'd like to point out to you in the Senate Bill there has been a cap. of \$2,500 put on this particular Section and it doesn't impose that much of a penalty and I would reject the idea that this Amendment should be adopted."

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

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the worst type of Amendments because behind the charade of doing something to reduce insurance costs, let me explain personally what this Amendment does. First of all, it almost mandates that an injured worker hire a lawyer. Now, I respect the Assistant Minority Leader not being a lawyer and handling this, but if there's ever an Amendment that's adopted to the Workmen's Compensation Act, this Amendment almost mandates an injured worker to hire a lawyer. The need of a lawyer's apparent just by reading the language. You want to know what really galls me about this, that if the time the injured worker is laying on his back in the hospital, this is the time when, under this Amendment, the injured worker's family who needs to eat, who needs to pay their rent, who needs to pay their doctor bills, are going to be denied their temporary disability benefits. Now, for the life of me, I've read this Amendment on another Bill and I just can't understand where anyone thinks that this kind of an Amendment is going to help reduce the benefit costs of the insurance industry's greed. It



just doesn't take place. This is a bad Amendment. This Amendment requires an injured worker to suffer more than just the injury. It makes him suffer because he's going to be denied through the wording of this Amendment, their temporary total disability benefits, especially when they're laying in a hospital. And I might point out that some injuries take place that when an injured worker is in the hospital and unconscious that they couldn't even notify the Commission that their injury, when their family needs that money, this Amendments protects the insurance carrier, the insurance company from starting to make the payments. Now, it's just a bad Amendment and shouldn't even be considered and I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Schuneman: "A question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

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

Schuneman: "Representative Walsh, I know that... well, first of all, I don't think any insurance company or any employer should be protected if they practice delay in the payment of Workmen's Compensation benefits. But one problem that I know does exist and I'm wondering if this problem bears on the Amendment. Many times an employer or an insurance company has difficulty getting a medical report from a doctor so that that insurance company or employer can determine whether or not the injury is truly a compensable injury. Could you comment as to how this Amendment would affect that sort of situation where the employer would be more or less powerless to know whether the injury is really compensable or not?"

Walsh: "Well, that is exactly what the Amendment goes to. It goes to negotia... it goes to questions such as that where payments are not made by the insurance company because the doctor has not given his report or the report has been inadequate; and unfortunately, the employer is, as you say, powerless to do anything about it, but the fine is levied against the employer. Now, I can understand that the fine would have to be levied against the employer, but he ought to be given a little bit of time to take care of it."



Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, if I may address the Bill or the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, sir. Proceed."

Schuneman: "It seems to me that this is a perfect logical Amendment that the employer or the employer insurance company who may be in violation and may, in fact, be delaying, should be given written notice that those people, those employers and insurance companies who are not practicing delay and rather are the victims of the fact that they can't get adequate reports, should not be penalized. And I would urge the adoption of the Amendment."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this law triggers in only when there is willful negligence on the part of the employer, not under ordinary delays or ordinary stoppages or ordinary circuitous methods that the employer and the insurance companies use. I know cases where women have had to go plead with the Personnel Directors of certain industries for their husbands Workmen's Compensation check and Mr. Walsh in his magnanimity, wants to give the woeful, negligent copulator five more days. That's what he's trying to do. The guy's on his back and his wife is pleading for the rent money. He wants to give the woeful employer five more days. That's what he's trying to do with this Amendment. I think it's a disgrace to this House."

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

Sangmeister: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Sangmeister: "Representative Walsh, you have a number of Amendments and so have other people here and those of us that are concerned about some possible meaning Amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act are going to be concerned about the thing that everybody's screaming about. And that is the increase in premiums. I would say to you that I do feel the insurance companies have taken advantage of this situation and they are partly at fault here, but my question to you on your Amendment is, do you really feel that this Amendment is going to do anything toward reducing the increased premiums that employers have incurred as a



result of the passage of this Act?"

Walsh: "Well, this does not address itself at all to the premium. It addresses itself, however, to the cost of doing business because the fines are levied against the employer. So, if you want to consider that fine as a part of the premium, you may and it will reduce premiums to that extent or cost."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, do you wish to close, sir?"

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, those people that spoke against this Amendment were not speaking against this Amendment. Apparently, there's something later on that they were addressing themselves to. Representative Hill suggested that we were doing something about safety within manufacturing plants. We are not at all. We are not, in this Amendment, addressing ourselves to benefits that injured persons might receive, not at all. We are solely addressing ourselves to penalties levied upon employers for instances that may very well not be their fault. We are giving them a five day stay from the time that they are notified of delays instead of levying the fine the same day that the employer is notified. I think that's reasonable and I urge your support."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1967. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Jacobs, to explain his vote."

Jacobs: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you know, I think maybe we're worrying about something that we should not be worrying about. As far as I can ascertain, there's never been a penalty of \$10 because this is all taken into consideration before any penalty is ever assessed. So therefore, I think that we're worrying about something or using this \$10 a day penalty as a reason to oppose this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 58 'ayes', 79 'nays', and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further



Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #4, Leinenweber. Amends Senate Bill 1967, page 35 by striking lines 25 through 35 and so forth."

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

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 is a relatively minor Amendment, but I believe it strikes out what is a rather unfair and bad portion of the Act and that is on page 35 of the Act, it strikes subparagraph M which permits the Commission to levy a 25% extra compensation penalty for accidents caused as a result of willful violation of OSHA. Now, first of all, in the event that a 25% extra compensation penalty was imposed, it would involve a double penalty in addition to that penalty that the employer would be subject to for having violated the federal Act. Secondly, I don't believe it's the job of the state to go about enforcing federal Acts. And thirdly, it seems to me that it flies in the face of the reason why the Workmen's Compensation Act was enacted in the first place and that was to remove the idea of fault from assessment of compensation. And also it turns compensation into something more than compensation. In other words, an employee is given more money than he would be entitled to strictly as compensation as set by the Act. I think it's a relatively minor change. It's certainly a reasonable one and although in and of itself, would not make a significant change in the overall cost of carrying out the Workmen's Compensation Act, but it would be one less of a burden to impose upon employers and insurance companies and I think it's a good Amendment. It isn't all that significant in the wide range of the Act itself, but I think it's a reasonable one and I would urge its adoption."

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

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Amendment would delete the 25% penalty for willful violation. This is a company that willfully wants to violate the health and safety standards under the Health and Safety Act. We're not talking about some employer who may have violated the Act. We're talking



about some company who willfully and let me tell you something, those of you who want to protect good companies, you don't want to protect those that willfully want to violate the Act because that kind of injury spreads across to those good companies and that's exactly what's wrong with this Amendment. They want to spread the cost of a bad company on to good companies. And if you're a right-thinking conservative thinking of protecting those good employers from higher and higher premiums, this Amendment should be defeated overwhelmingly."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker, could I ask you a question? Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, sir."

Hill: "'I am the Sponsor of this Senate Bill and if I am to talk in opposition to an Amendment, then would I also be allowed to talk after the vote is called for in explaining my vote?"

Speaker Bradley: "We have been doing that, sir. We've been doing it with the Sponsor of the Amendment and I believe he's right, Mr. Hill. If you talk during debate, then you are not..."

Hill: "'Even though I'm the Sponsor of this Senate Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "It's the rule. Now, you can talk at end..."

Hill: "No, that's okay."

Speaker Bradley: "All right."

Hill: "That's okay. I'll talk to explain my vote then."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Luft."

Luft: "Would the Sponsor yield please?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Luft: "Who determines if there is a violation of the Health and Safety Act?"

Leinenweber: "You mean under the Act now?"

Luft: "Right."

Leinenweber: "Well, it would be the arbitrator."

Luft: "And he determines also if it's willful."

Leinenweber: "That's correct. Well, it'd be the Commission in the last analysis, but the arbitrator... then it would be confirmed presumably by the Commission. Either/or."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Bradley: "Do you wish to close, sir?"

Leinenweber: "Yes, I would again point out..."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, it should be pointed out again that this was after the employer has been cited more than once, twice and it's been shown to him where he's in dereliction of his safety standards. This is not just a capricious decision. This is after he knows he's willfully in noncompliance. This is a terrible Amendment. It should be defeated."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hud... The Lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "I want a question of the Sponsor, if I may?"

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

Geo-Karis: "Under the present Act, can you tell me whether the employer would be already penalized for violation of the Occupational Safety and Health Act under the OSHA rule? But if the Sponsor can't answer me, I wonder if I could ask one of the labor people?"

Leinenweber: "I didn't understand the question. Would you repeat it?"

Geo-Karis: "Under this Act, Mr. Sponser, rather... without this Act, are the employers already penalized for violations of the Occupational Safety and Health Act under the OSHA rule?"

Leinenweber: "They certainly could be if they violated the federal Act. They could be cited and penalized, certainly."

Geo-Karis: "Well, I wonder if I could ask a question of Mr. Hanahan on this point?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hanahan, are you back there to respond? He indicates that he will respond, Ms. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "My question is under the OSHA Act at the present time, without this Amendment, are there not penalties for violations of this Act existing against the employer? And if so, to what extent?"

Hanahan: "Let Representative Hill answer this. He works in a factory and he could explain it."



Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hill, would you explain this."

Hill: "In answer to your question, there are these slips of paper hanging all over the place that I work at. They have deadlines set on these slips of paper where OSHA has made an investigation. Consequently, what happens, we have so few, so few, mind you, investigators for OSHA that they never come back and look whether or not this has been straightened out."

Geo-Karis: "That's not what I asked you."

Hill: "Well, I'm getting to it. Of all of the citations that have been issued at this plant I work at, very few fines have ever been issued. One of the best ways they can be fined, but very few fines are enacted."

Geo-Karis: "But they can be fined under the federal law, is that right?"

Hill: "In very small amounts."

Geo-Karis: "Well, what is the maximum fine, can you tell me, Jack, that could be assessed against the violators?"

Hill: "The investigator can fine the factory immediately or they can say, fix this up in 30 days or 10 days, 40 days or 100 days and then if it's not done, they could enact a fine. But very seldom do they enact a fine under the OSHA law. That remains there, the hazard remains there."

Geo-Karis: "But under the OSHA law, if I recall correctly, if the investigator wanted to..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, for what purpose do you rise?"

Leinenweber: "Well, this is highly unusual for a Member to debate or question another Member during the course of debate on an Amendment. I think it's out of order and I would object to it."

Speaker Bradley: "I think your point's well taken."

Geo-Karis: "Well, I wasn't debating. I was simply trying to..."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, we went from Mr. Hanahan to Mr. Hill and I think the Gentleman's point's well taken. If you'd like to talk to the... or speak to the Amendment, fine."

Geo-Karis: "Well, then I will speak on the Amendment in this manner."



Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Geo-Karis: "If I recall correctly, under the OSHA Act, the investigator can without a preliminary hearing, issue a fine or penalty against the employer. Without a hearing, if he feels that it's justified and if that's the case, then I wonder if we wouldn't be putting the employer in double jeopardy by the inclusion of the language that's already in Senate Bill 1967 and which language is sought to be excluded by Amendment 4."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. It's the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman's motion carries. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, to close."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, of course the really objectionable part of subparagraph M and why it should be stricken out and why Amendment #4 ought to be adopted. It is a case of double penalty and by the way, an OSHA violation can be very, very minimal type of situation. All I can say is that if a person is injured in the course and scope of his employment, he's entitled to compensation. Last year, we enacted a Bill that gave very, very extensive benefits for and some think even excessive benefits for injuries. There's no reason in the world why an employee ought to receive a bonus if perchance the injury results from a violation of OSHA which can be either a fine or can actually be a closing down of a man's place of business. I think it's a reasonable Amendment. It will go part of way towards making this a more reasonable Bill and I urge the adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Bradley: "The question's on the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1967. All those in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. It's the opinion of the Chair... all those in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman, to explain his vote. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre, to explain his vote."



Beaupre: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm basically in favor of the compensation Bills that we passed last year, but I do think that there are some areas that deserve some attention and some clean up. And I think this Amendment is a typical example. When we're talking about Workmen's Compensation, we're talking about compensation. A compensatory payment to an injured party who has lost something as a result of being injured on the job. What Mr. Leinenweber's Amendment addresses itself to is a penalty provision. There's no place in this Act for that type of a measure and we would do ourselves well, it seems to me, by clearing up and defining the difference between something compensatory and something which is indeed a penalty and I think there's not reason for having it in the Act. The penalty provision occurs in other Acts, in the federal Act and we ought to get it out of here and I think this is an appropriate Amendment."

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

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, rise in support of this Amendment because I think to act contrary to this Amendment will be setting a precedent that we may regret. It would seem to me that the penalties involved here are set forth under federal statutes and it is improper...(microphone turned off)."

Speaker Bradley: "I'm sorry, sir. Continue."

Hudson: "It is improper and I believe dangerous for us to begin to set into law those things that would force, those things that would penalize an employer, in this case, for not, for being in violation of the federal law when the federal law already carries its own penalties. Now, for us to go a step further and say we're going to further penalize the employer for failure where those penalties already exist and I know this has been stated before but I think it's wrong. I think we're becoming lackeys in this sense for the feds who should be able to take care of their own bailiwick and as they pass these laws, they should set themselves up in a way to enforce



those laws and not leave it to a mechanism such as this to enforce the laws that they've already made."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart, to explain his vote."

Hart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a good Amendment for two reasons. It removes double jeopardy from the employer who is an adequate remedy for the violation that exists under the federal Act. And secondly, why should any violation be tied to the rate of recovery or claim of an employee. I think it's ridiculous. I don't think that labor ever expected to get this in the Bill when he introduced it last year and certainly, this is a right time to eliminate it from the Act. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. This question there's 78 'ayes' and 82 'nays'. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Poll the absentees, would you, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "I had my light on and I would of liked to have said just a few words."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, sir, and explain your vote."

Hill: "This particular Amendment...(microphone turned off)."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, sir."

Hill: "Amendment #4, if you will read the law as it exists, it says, 'Willful violations'. 'Willful violations'. Now it seems to me that if you take this out, what you are doing is condoning safety violations in the State of Illinois. And it seems to me that you're going to harm many people in the State of Illinois when you take this out. It says, 'Willful'. Now, willful, as you people know, especially I have heard attorneys speak on subjects like this, willful is very difficult to prove and why you would eliminate something like this when in the long run, it would make a much safer working place for all of the people of this State of Illinois. This is a very bad Amendment and I would wish that you would vote 'no'."



Speaker Bradley: "Call the absentees."

Clerk Selcke: "Barnes, Jane, Campbell, Capparelli, Capuzi."

Speaker Bradley: "Capparelli wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'."

Clerk Selcke: "Capparelli 'no'. Craig, Dyer, Farley."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kane wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'."

Clerk Selcke: "Kane is changed from 'yes' to 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Luft wishes to change his vote from 'aye' to 'no'."

Clerk Selcke: "Klosak, Kucharski, Molloy, Rose, Terzich, Wall, White."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question there's 76 'ayes' and 85 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion is lost. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #5, Leinenweber. Amends Senate Bill 1967 on page 36 and so forth."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #5 is certainly a very reasonable Amendment and it strikes subparagraph N which is on page 36 of the Bill. And this is the provision that provides for a 6% interest to be entered on the..."

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

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know how many other Members have the problem that I have, but I have gone completely through my stack of Amendments on this Bill. I start off with Amendment #1 and then I jump to Amendment #11 and there's all those missing in between that's just not there and I'm just wondering if..."

Leinenweber: "They've been distributed."

Madison: "Well, they must have missed my desk because I've gone through every Amendment that I have and I just don't..."

Speaker Bradley: "We'll check and while we're checking, Mr. Leinenweber, continue while we're checking to see if they've been distributed."

Leinenweber: "In any event, subparagraph N which Amendment #5 seeks to strike provides for 6% interest on the award of an arbitrator and this, in my opinion, is quite unreasonable because of the fact that the award is not final, subject to change, subject



to a trial they know will go before the Commission which is the right of either party to ask for and it certainly seems to me that we should not provide a penalty for the employer to appeal the decision. As a matter of fact, as I read it, it goes on to say that the employer's insurance carrier may tender the payments due under the award to stop the accrual of interest. When you stop to think, this means that you actually have to pay the award and I would suggest that somewhere down the pike if the award is reversed or reduced, it'll be virtually impossible and certainly create a lot of havoc for the employer to try to recover back an award that has been reduced or eliminated by the Commission. Again, it's a relatively minor thing but it certainly would decrease the cost of running the Workmen's Compensation insurance for a plant. I think it's very reasonable. We shouldn't penalize the person for taking their, all of their rights under the Act and I would urge the adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Bradley: "In regards to Mr. Madison's inquiry, I'm informed that Amendments 1 through 20 have been distributed, sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Apparently, the problem just occurred at this end, Mr. Speaker, 'cause Representative Williams and I, both, have the same problem."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, let's see if we can take care of that problem, then."

Madison: "Well, I've been taken care of."

Speaker Bradley: "Take care of Mr. Williams. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment would relieve the insurance companies and employers from paying interest of 6% on an award of the arbitrator of the Industrial Commission and thereby encourage frivolous appeals often employed by companies for delaying tactics and to force the injured worker or his dependents to accept the lesser amount. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I've been in this House for a few years and I've heard a lot of crocodile tears being



shed for higher interest rates, especially when it comes around time to change the usury limitation. Now it seems like it's awful odd that a person that stands up and says that they're willing to have and sock the people with a 9 1/2% usury limitation, is a little afraid to allow an injured worker the ability to draw 6% on an award made to him."

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

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, this is the Workmen's Compensation Bill, not the Usury Act and I wish the Gentleman would confine his remarks to this."

Hanahan: "I'm well aware of that, sir and I'm well aware of parallel arguments..."

Speaker Bradley: "Would the Gentleman confine his remarks to Amendment #5."

Hanahan: "If you believe in 9 1/2% interest for some savings and loans, why aren't you in favor of 6% interest on some injured worker's settlement? That's the question on this Amendment and the Amendment is a bad Amendment because after a person is injured and after the award is made, that is the time when this Amendment would affect the injured person or the injured worker's family from at least drawing interest while some frivolous appeal for the dependents from being paid would take place. This is a bad Amendment, should be defeated."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if the Sponsor will yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Geo-Karis: "If the claimant will appeal it and the claimant fares worse after his or her appeal, the claimant does not pay any 6%, is that right?"

Leinenweber: "That's correct and you point out another bad part about this. The claimant can actually appeal a decision of the arbitrator under this provision and because the award was inadequate and get, if he got an increased award, he'd be entitled to 6%. Now he, by his own action, has delayed the receipt of the award."



Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I question the constitutionality of the present Act which will penalize someone from appealing their rights. A claimant has just as much right to appeal a decision of the arbitrator under the present law as a company for whom he or she is, by whom he or she is employed. I also question the fact that the present law penalizes the employer. I've handled cases where people insisted on appealing their case and got less, but they didn't pay 6% penalty. I think this is a good Amendment and I think this is fair because under the present law, either the claimant or the company, the employer, can appeal. No one is precluded from appeal, but you're penalizing one class and I submit the present law is unconstitutional when you don't apply it to all. And therefore, I speak for the Amendment."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Sangmeister: "Representative Leinenweber, if I was to file a common law action in tort in the circuit court against you and recover a judgement for any amount of money, whatever it may be, and that judgement is not paid after it's been entered in record by the presiding judge, does that judgement carry interest?"

Leinenweber: "Yes, it does."

Sangmeister: "Then I ask you what is the difference between interest on arbitrators award and an interest that is going to be added on by way of statute on a common law tort injury."

Leinenweber: "Well, an arbitrator's award is not a final order. It's only final when the Commission confirms it. I think that's a very distinct difference."

Sangmeister: "Well, then, well, you have to understand also we do have an appellate court to which the appeal can be taken on a common law injury as well."

Leinenweber: "Well, there's a difference between an appeal of a circuit court judgement which is final and an appeal which is a



trial de novo. In effect, the arbitrator's decision is sort of a pretrial type of thing that can be either accepted or rejected by either party."

Sangmeister: "May I speak to the Amendment. I'm sorry."

Speaker Bradley: "You certainly may, sir."

Sangmeister: "Well, I'm looking forward here to some meaningful Amendments that we could do with this Bill. I'm not putting this one down as not having some substance. That's true, but of all the Amendments to be considered, I think this is one that is not going to help the problem and I would urge its defeat."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Cunningham: "Would this Amendment bar after the Commission had affirmed the award if there were a pending appeal to the circuit court?"

Leinenweber: "It's my understanding, 'no'."

Cunningham: "I'd like to speak just for a moment."

Speaker Bradley: "You certainly may, sir."

Cunningham: "The... I think this Amendment is terrible. It's too cold-blooded even for me to vote for. People that can afford the luxury of the appeal and the time that it involves are those with the money, the insurance companies. And to deny the injured party the right to have interest on his award for the injury he has suffered just seems to be almost inhumane. I'll vote 'no'."

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

Giorgi: "Speaker, I'd like to take a moment of the House to tell the House that this change was not enacted last year on this Senate Bill 234 and 235. This one was in the law prior to last year and it was a result of a Supreme Court decision. Now, this is after the arbitrator has granted the award and it's before the Industrial Commission and I think it does create situations where the employer or the insurance companies know that the injured man has been on his back many times a period



and they feel that he's at his low ebb, good time to take advantage of him and I think it's a very inhumane Amendment by Mr. Leinenweber."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Coffey, your light's been flashing for some time. Do you wish to speak, sir? The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, everyone here knows that I very seldom support a contention of Representative Hanahan, but for one time, I believe he's right. That's very unusual, of course; but if an award has been granted by an arbitrator, the insurance company of the employer as the case may be, may put that money with the Industrial Commission. They don't have to worry about any interest charges. And so, I don't see why this Amendment is necessary. It's absolutely uncalled for. They can kill the Bill without interest by just putting it on deposit. We should defeat this very bad Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is an Amendment only to help those companies and business people in the State of Illinois that are trying to chisel on Workmen's Compensation cases. I feel confident there are very few like this in the State of Illinois. I fully understand that at the place I work, when an award is granted, that check is forthcoming in a hurry. And I feel confident that the good business people of the State of Illinois do the same thing. What Representative Leinenweber is trying to do is help the shysters in this field and I suggest you vote against this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Leinenweber, to close. Mr. Leinenweber, to close."

Leinenweber: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Amendment and myself, I guess, have been called about everything under the sun during this debate. However, the fact of the matter remains that most awards are not appealed to the Industrial Commission. However, that is a right and is a right of both the employee and the employer if they are



dissatisfied with an award to take an appeal and ask for a completely new trial. In other words, it's a... the arbitrator's award' is merely a quick way to try to resolve the dispute. If it cannot be resolved at that level, then either party is entitled to an appeal. It can work both ways, but under this particular provision of the Act, if an employee appeals and gets a higher award, he is entitled to interest even though it has been his action that has prevented him from receiving his award. If the employer appeals, he also must run the risk of either paying additional interest or tendering the amount and trying to get it back which everybody would realize it would be extremely difficult. I think it is a reasonable Amendment. It certainly does not deny anybody any right. When the award becomes final, interest accrues as it should and if a person proceeds on a final order, then that person, of course, would... ought to pay interest in the event that he is unsuccessful up above. But, we're talking about that period of time between the allowance of the arbitrator's award and a trial de novo before the Commission. We should not penalize a person for pursuing his rights under this Act and I certainly urge the adoption of Amendment #5 and ask for a Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #5. to Senate Bill 1967. All in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 32 'ayes', there are 110 'nos' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #6, Tuerk. Amends Senate Bill 1967 on page 16, line 7 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there's been a lot of concern over the period of the last few years about hearing loss as it relates to Workmen's Comp. and as this Bill came to the House, there was a provision in the Bill that provided for some standards for hearing, but it also included some other



things such as sight and so on. Perhaps in the very objective viewpoint, this was an oversight that it shouldn't of been that inclusive. So that part of the Bill was taken out in Amendment, as I recall, Amendment #1. Now the purpose of Amendment #6 is to establish back into the Bill those provisions which would... that we could establish some medically acceptable hearing loss standards after holding, carrying. Now, Illinois is one of the few major industrial states that does not have a set of hearing loss standards. Wisconsin, for example, has had such standards for three or more years and has found that they encourage faster settlements and reduce court battles. The present system encourages disagreements between doctors over what constitutes partial loss of hearing and full loss of hearing. And that's the reason for this Amendment. It's much needed to give the Industrial Commission an opportunity to establish some medically acceptable standards relative to hearing loss and it would bring back into the Bill some semblance of order relative to that particular phase of the Act. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #6."

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

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, if I were to categorize almost all the Amendments that have been presented on this Bill, I have to consider this as one of the worst Amendments. This Amendment would authorize the Commission to do what this Legislature has refused to do, to set standards in hearing losses. Under a false impression of simplification, it could reduce benefits on account of the workers age, prior condition, his environment, what section of town he lives in or any other reason. We are dealing with human beings, not with cattle. Each injury affects people differently, especially in hearing. And each case must be judged on its own merit and fully compensated. Equality in denial of justice is not justice. This was never in the Workmen's Compensation Act. Standards are deductions and I'll give you an example. Number one, let's say the standards were set down that no compensation for a 25%



loss of hearing. Number two, let's reduce the compensation for every year after you're 40 years of age because all of a sudden you know that once you reach 40, you're going to start losing some hearing. No compensation for loss of high tones over the 2,000 frequency. These are standard. No compensation for the loss of tones under the 500 frequency. And no claim can be made until after 6 months of separation from the exposure. Now, this is what we're talking about when you say in a real simplified way under this Amendment that we're going to have the Industrial Commission set standards. Well, let me tell every Member of this House that just the fact that we're exposed to noise in the place we live, in the place we work, in this very General Assembly by sometimes a tirade by Hanahan or some other Member, helps hurt your hearing. So, should you have a deduction set on your ears by not a legislative body, but by the Industrial Commission to set some standards that because you're over 40, so therefore, you shouldn't be compensated because you went deaf at your place of employment or because you live in the section of town where there's an elevated going by and your hearing is affected. Should the Industrial Commission say, well, because you live in that section of town, your hearing has been affected, so therefore, you can't claim a full loss of hearing, even though you're totally deaf. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're talking about an injured worker, a person with blood running through his veins and a soul, not some piece of cattle, not some bird. We're talking about human beings that should be treated with dignity and a Workmen's Compensation hearing should treat that worker, that injured worker with dignity. And I'd urge a 'no' vote on this worst of all Amendments."

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

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Sponsor of the Amendment indicates that he'll yield."

Madison: "Representative Tuerk, am I to understand that the essence



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

of your Amendment is to have the Industrial Commission establish that which by your own admission, the medical profession has not been able to agree on?"

Speaker Bradley: "Turn on Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "No, that isn't what I'm suggesting at all. There's been standards as I said in the initial part of the debate on this Amendment. Many states have standards on hearing. Illinois just doesn't have standards. We've attempted to get that put into the statutes. What the Representative from McHenry was reading, litany of some other state's standards, that doesn't necessarily mean that that would be the Illinois standards. What the Amendment suggests, that we give the Industrial Commission the opportunity to establish some medically acceptable hearing loss standards after public hearings."

Madison: "Representative Tuerk, if I understood you in your opening remarks, you indicated that one of the problems was in not having these standards is that in cases like this, members of the medical profession, specifically doctors, cannot agree. Was that not the essence of your..."

Tuerk: "No, I did not say that whatsoever."

Madison: "I certainly wish we could..."

Tuerk: "...made no mention of that."

Madison: "It's too bad we can't play the tape back, Representative Tuerk, because that is specifically what you said."

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

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've heard many of you, my colleagues, ask about meaningful Amendments. Well, here we have one. This is a meaningful Amendment. The problem with the law that we have now is not in the fact that it would compensate an injured worker for his injury. I find no fault with that. The fault that I find with the law is that it is so very difficult to determine the extent of the injury. Human beings have a loss of hearing as a result of many causes. Aging is one. Other causes might be an injury in an employment, in a prior employment. Loss of



hearing could've resulted from service in the military, a hunting accident or many other activities of life, all of which might be unknown to the employer. Now the way the law is presently set up, it is almost impossible for an employer to defend against an employee who says he has had a 100% loss of hearing as a result of his employment. Whereas, he may have had some loss of hearing prior to the accident and all this Amendment seeks to do is set up some standards for loss of hearing. In no way will this eliminate the loss of hearing benefits to the injured worker. It's a perfectly reasonable Amendment. It's a meaningful Amendment and it's one that we should adopt."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Madison alluded to it earlier. The medical profession has trouble determining what is a hearing loss. Well, you ought to talk to people who have hearing losses, talk to people that work in packing plants and drop forges and sheet metal plants that are stamping out automobile bodies. These are the people that lose 100% of hearing and if the guy had 40% of hearing or 50% of hearing because of a hereditary problem, he's losing 100%, not 50%. This is a terrible Amendment and I think it's... it would be indicative of the Taft-Hartley type attitude towards labor problems."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, to close."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as Representative Schuneman pointed out just a moment ago, this is a meaningful Amendment. I'm sorry I didn't characterize it as such, but I felt that the Membership would be conversing with the fact that this would be meaningful. This is an area that is fraught with many, many problems and this is one way to get at the problem. We've debated the problems of loss of hearing on this floor on many, many occasions. What this Amendment says is that we allow, after some public hearings and there would certainly be input from all sections of society, the opportunity to provide some acceptable standards for hearing loss. That's



all it does. It is meaningful. It does have some substance to it and it's an opportunity to improve the present law with the adoption of this Amendment to Senate Bill 1967. I would move for the adoption."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1967. All in favor will vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 64 'ayes', 87 'nays'. The Gentleman's motion is lost. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #7, Tuerk. Amends Senate Bill 1967 on page 11, line 24 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #7 is also a meaningful Amendment because what it would do is reduce some of the costs connected with Workmen's Compensation coverage, because in the long run what it would do is, I believe, reduce some premiums somewhere along the way. I can't tell you precisely when, but you've heard a lot about the cap on benefits and right now, we've discussed the floating cap. Now, what this Amendment does it would require that a cap of \$15,000 would be the maximum yearly benefit that any one individual could earn in any one year for permanent total disability or death benefit. Now, as a little background on this and I think this is important, the cap would be substantially higher than the present floating cap of \$10,400. What I'm suggesting with this Amendment is that we go to the \$15,000 cap, rather than this floating cap which is now \$10,400, I believe it's \$10,485. Actually, the floating cap is really not a cap at all when you think in terms of as a mandatory benefit increases and inflation will push the floating cap to almost \$12,000 by July of this year which is just a week away, to \$18,000 in round figures in 1977 and up to \$24,000 by 1979, and close to \$31,000 in 1981. That is the real effect of this floating cap. It just keeps escalating upward to the point where we get up to that \$31,000 level in 1981. So, you



can see we can be easily back to the old argument that some people would be back to that million dollar settlement which we all think is a bad idea and insurance premiums will continue to rise. Now the suggestion in this Amendment would put the cap at the \$15,000 level. I think it's a reasonable Amendment. It has some substance to it and I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

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

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, under the pretense of conveying the false impression of increasing the present limit of \$205 times 52 weeks per year or \$10,660 per year, this Amendment would take away the future rights of injured workers or their dependents in case of death. The most important part of this law is that nowhere does it deal specific amounts for the future. Future benefits and injuries or deaths occurring five, ten or twenty years from now would be governed entirely by then prevailing average weekly wage in manufacturing industries. This Amendment would set a \$15,000 limit. Now I could honestly say that if I wanted to be selfish, we should adopt this. And hopefully as we increase our Democratic majority here in the House and Senate in the State of Illinois, we will continue to raise that cap, but all that would do by the adopting of this Amendment to this Bill right now would be to raise the insurance premiums. And if you want to address yourself to that issue and I thought that was the reason why we got all the mail and all the hoopla about the Workmen's Compensation Bill was because of the high increase of the premium costs, you adopt this Amendment and you'll see a raise because we're trying to hold it down to the maximum or the work week, the average manufacturing work week which, in effect, this year is \$10,660 cap. Now, this Amendment will make it \$15,000 cap. So if you want to raise the insurance premium costs of this coming year, adopt this Amendment or the one that's following because they've even backed it up with a raise to \$20,000. But the fact remains is the way the law is presently set with this Bill amending it. It would cap it



at a reasonable level of... so that the \$80,000 executive that everyone's been lied to about, that got killed and his widow's going to get \$40,000 a year for life, so that that kind of example can't be used in the arguments against benefit levels for total death or for total disability or death. I say this is a bad Amendment. It's bad in the point that it's going to raise the premium, not lower it. It will raise it and you ask any one from the insurance industry if this Amendment goes on the Bill, what it will do to your premium. It has to raise it versus what we're doing with the cap at the \$10,660 level. I think this Amendment should be defeated."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, to close."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Gentleman from McHenry has a way to twisting the facts which are pretty persuasive to some people, but he hasn't proved to me that his argument has any substance to it at all because really what this does is raise the cap over what the floating cap is at the present time, but what I just said a few moments ago that that floating cap really means no cap at all because it just keeps going up, up, up, up, up. And what this will do is at least level it off to... it's a more generous cap than what we're proposing as of today and what it would be as of July 1 of this year, but what I said a moment ago over the period of the next three or four years, it's going up to the extent that it'll be not only the \$15,000 level, it will be at least double that and probably more. Now, the problem if inflation continues, the Legislature can always amend that cap upward, if it needs to be amended upward; but I think it's a reasonable approach at this time to establish that cap at the \$15,000 level and I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1967. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no' and the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill, to explain his vote. Mr. Hill, you wish to explain your vote, sir? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. This question, there's



66 'ayes', 78 'nays'. The Gentleman's motion is lost. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #8, Tuerk. Amends Senate Bill 1967 on page 11, line 24 and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment #8 will just prove to you how magnanimous an individual I really am. I'm proposing with this Amendment to go to the cap of \$20,000. Now, what I just said a while ago about the \$15,000 cap being generous, I think you'll all have to admit that by going the \$20,000, why, I don't see how anybody can turn that one down. So, I would just move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #8 to Senate Bill 1967. All in favor say 'aye' or vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Schlickman, your light's flashing. Did you wish to explain your vote, sir? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. This question, there's 70 'ayes', 82 'nos'. The Gentleman's motion loses. Further Amendments."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #9, Tuerk. Amends Senate Bill 1967 on page 1, line 6."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "I think Mr. Fleck's seeking recognition there."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fleck, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Chair would let the Membership know if we're going to be here through dinner or if we're going to adjourn at an hour to go out and eat."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, I think it's the intention of the Chair to try to get this Bill or at least finish the Amendments and that depends on the Membership how long we take to get that done, Mr. Fleck. There's no way to determine how long it's going to take, but we're going to try to move this Bill to Third Reading or at least get through these Amendments."



Fleck: "Well, this Bill and then we're going on our way?"

Speaker Bradley: "Well, there might be two or three other things. Gentlemen have asked us to move a few motions and one concurrence and after this, I wouldn't think it would be too long, but depends on the Membership on how long we talk on these Amendments. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk. Amendment #9."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'll tell you. I'm not going beyond that \$20,000 cap, so don't look for anymore goodies over there but here's an Amendment which I know you can't turn down because it's so reasonable and sensible that anybody in their right voting spirit just can't afford to pass it by. Now, the present law because of a fluke in the present law, as I would characterize it, a surviving spouse may still be paid a dependent's benefit for any surviving children, even those children have passed the age of 25 or being eligible for dependent benefits. What this Amendment would do is merely cut off the dependent benefits to surviving spouse once all the children cease to be dependent and that's all it does and I think it's very reasonable approach to a minor problem which was actually, should've been taken care of in the Bill when it was drafted last year and it's part of the law now and I think it's a bad part of it and I think it should be amended. I would move for the adoption."

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

Hanahan: "Very simply, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. We don't pay Representatives any difference whether they have children or not. It's a fluke in the law and I might point out that this Amendment is purported to correct the present confusion about benefits for a widow having children at the time of death of the employee and remarries with children still at home. But this may... even though this may be a problem because of the wordage, but the removal of life benefits should not be included in the solution. What he's doing here is he's confusing a purported problem and throwing out the baby with the dirty water. What he is doing here is removing the life



benefits that should be paid to the widow and I think it's a bad Amendment. What you're doing is striking down the help that's necessary to the widow or widowers, I might point out. Could be a widower also receiving this benefit and he's trying to eliminate that with this Amendment and I urge a 'no' vote on it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Catania: "Representative Tuerk, is that true that you really want to remove the benefits of a widow?"

Tuerk: "No, as I said a while ago, the Gentleman from McHenry has a way of twisting the facts to make it sound like we're a bunch of ogres over on this side of the aisle and just twists the truth so terribly that he gets everybody all upset. Now, what I'm attempting to do is just remove those children as a dependent once they reach a certain age and once all the dependents are no longer dependents, then the dependent allowance ceases to exist. That's all."

Catania: "Is there still allowance for the widow or widower?"

Tuerk: "Yes."

Catania: "Well, it didn't sound that way in your original explanation and I was very concerned at the thought that you might want to be cutting off a woman who had labored all these years to make a home for her husband and children. You wouldn't want to do a thing like that, would you?"

Tuerk: "You know I would never do anything like that."

Catania: "I couldn't imagine that you would."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman wish to close? The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, to close."

Tuerk: "I think..."

Speaker Bradley: "I'm sorry. The Gentleman... well, Mr. Hill, you wish to... he's already closed the question and is on the Amendment #9, the adoption of Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 1967. All in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Gentleman requests



a Roll Call. All in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill, to explain his vote."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment goes much, much further than Representative Tuerk has told you about. It removes the life benefit and this is the kicker in his Amendment and I would suggest if you read this very closely because under his Amendment and he did not explain that to you, there removes life benefits and that goes for the widow and the children. And it's just a catchy little Amendment that should be defeated immediately."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 67 'ayes' and 87 'nos' and the Gentleman's motion is lost. Further Amendments."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #10, Deavers. Amends Senate Bill 1967 on page 1, line 6 by inserting '1' and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #10 requires that all new employees hired by an employer and covered by Workmen's Compensation Act must submit to a complete physical examination financed by the employer within 10 days after being hired. For years and years, the unions have objected to the fact that we had pre-employment physicals. Now, we're having a post-employment physical because of the statutes and the things that some of the coverages that would occur and this way that we won't hire or fire any of the high-risk employees and some of the other good things and I can see no reason that this Amendment should not be adopted."

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

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is one of the more... I don't know, I shouldn't say it that way. This particular Amendment, Ladies and Gentlemen, will put more people on welfare in the State of Illinois than any other thing you can do in the Legislature. What this provides for is that 10 days prior to employment, that individual has to have a complete



and full examination. Now, what this will do and there are some industries that are doing it now, what this will do, that if you have a back injury, if you have a knee injury, if you have any injury where you could classify yourself under Workmen's Compensation, you would not be hired by that individual plant. Now, if you think the welfare rolls are high now, adopt this particular Amendment and you Republicans can scream to high heaven, blame it on anything you want, but it will be this Amendment and this Amendment alone. I could not under any condition, find employment in the State of Illinois because I have a ruptured disk. No one in the State of Illinois would hire me. If any of you people lose your job as State Representative and would end up in the mess of finding yourselves employed by industry and I think you would regret it, if you had any injury, whether it's serious or not, they would not hire you and how would you provide, how would you provide food, clothing, and housing for your family if you adopted this one?"

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

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in response to the last speaker, I think he misread the proposed Amendment. The Amendment says, 'Within 10 days after employment'. And it would seem to me if I may..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Bluthardt. The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Hill: "I would be happy to explain to the Gentleman that in most of the union contracts, the first 30 days of employment..."

Bluthardt: "Speaker, is this a matter of personal privilege on his part or what? I thought I had a right to speak."

Speaker Bradley: "I didn't know why the Gentleman..."

Hill: "I'd like to rise on a point of personal privilege."

Bluthardt: "Your name wasn't used."

Hill: "Well, you're accusing me of not explaining it properly and I want to clarify what the situation is."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hill, we'll recognize you to explain your vote. Mr. Bluthardt, continue, sir."



Bluthardt: "Well, I just want to point out that the proposed Amendment provides that there shall be an examination, a physical examination within 10 days after the hiring of the individual and it would seem to me that this is only fair and right. We do it with the Police Department, we do it with applicants for the Fire Department, we do it in promotional tests because the businessman, the manufacturer shouldn't be an insurer of the health of every employee, especially prior to employment. Would seem to me that if he is going to be responsible under Workmen's Compensation for the injuries and the health of all his employees, he'd better make damn sure that the employee is healthy before he hires him and I think this is an excellent Amendment to the Bill and I think we ought to support it."

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

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he'll yield."

Lundy: "Representative, it appears to me that this Amendment would require the employee within 10 days after being hired to have a physical paid for by the employer even if the employer doesn't feel a physical is necessary and doesn't want the employee to take a physical, that he has to pay for one anyway. Isn't that the effect of it?"

Deavers: "The way I read it I think you're probably correct."

Lundy: "Thank you. I would urge a 'no' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, if any of you have tried to get hospitalization insurance, you know that you can't insure against a pre-existing condition. Now, an employer is expected to insure his employees with Workmen's Compensation for anything that might befall him on the job and I don't know exactly how they can tell there was a pre-existing condition without an examination. And I think the hearing thing is a good example. If you'd hire someone with



a 50% hearing and then a year later he'd say, 'Well look, you've destroyed my hearing. I only have 50% hearing'. How would you know or be able to prove that he had bad hearing when he came? The same thing would be true of other existing conditions. I think all this does is protect the employer from hiring, from insuring someone with a condition that already existed which had nothing to do with his work on the job."

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

Stubblefield: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If I could address the Amendment for a moment, I think there's a number of reasons why this Amendment should not be passed. First, as was pointed out by Mr. Hill prior to being cut off, 'most union contracts will require and provide for at least a 30 day probationary period. Now, if an examination should reveal some physical impairment, the company would be at complete liberty under any of those contracts to then discharge that employee with or without cause. Many employees do not have the benefit of the union contract and in such cases, there's a perpetual probationary period. They can discharge them at any time, if though they've been there 15 or 20 years. Another reason for defeating this Amendment is that employers now have the right if they so desire to require a physical prior to an employment and provided they pay for the cost and I don't think we ought to be mandating additional cost to the employer when they say that we have already through the Workmen's Compensation Act, caused them additional cost that they don't want to pay. This would just be a further imposition. Thirdly, this Amendment should be defeated because the requirement for a physical is 10 days after employment and could preclude any liability to the employer for an injury that occurred during the first 9 days of employment. And thirdly, it would require an employer to pay for cost of an employee who they did not intend to keep beyond the 30 days. And this would be certainly a useless cost to the employer and I urge a resounding 'no' vote on this



Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Polk: "Gil, I'm concerned, would this also cover summer employment, kids that work at city parks, lifeguards, people who cut grass in the summer?"

Deavers: "No, I think that you can read into any Bill what you want to read in. That's arbitrary and 'ole fac'. It doesn't mandate that you give everybody a physical. I think the fact is that within 10 days you have the right. If you do not do it within 10 days, you forfeit that right."

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

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that last answer is completely in error. Let's read the Amendment. The Amendment says that provided that all such employees shall submit to a complete and thorough physical exam which shall be paid by the employer and which shall be conducted within 10 days subsequent to employment. There's no Americanization here. You'd think in Russia they'd have something like this in their laws, that all of a sudden an employee shall take that physical. That means that those of you who are insurance brokers that if you hire a girl to work for you in the office she shall, no matter how well you know here, no matter how nice a person she is, she shall submit to this physical, no matter on what grounds she may not. I could just say to you that if you want to see a most unAmerican, an unAmerican Amendment where you're mandating something, just adopt this Amendment; and then wonder why the cost of goods are increasing the employer has to pay on that... pass on that cost. And whether you wanted to agree to that employee to be hired with or without an examination is not the issue on this Amendment. This Amendment directly, directly says they shall have this physical. So, let's not kid ourselves. This is a bad Amendment. It might seem frivolous and silly, but it is an invasion of the rights that are enjoyed between the employee and



employer, without the state saying something that they don't have to say. And most reasonable people accept a physical exam if requested, but this is not a request. This is a mandate."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I know we're anxious to have a Roll Call, but I'd just like to make an observation here. They talk about a 30 day probationary period and that this calls for a physical examination within 10 days after you're going to take the position. When you talk about the interest of the individual, about about the interest of the individual, not just even talking about the one who's going to offer the employment, the employer himself. They say shall reject the individual, maybe it's in the individual's interest if something in the individual's examination shows up that the job he's hired for, there is a possibility of aggravating what they find. And I think it's... let's look at it from a different perspective. I think it's an excellent Amendment and should be adopted."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The question is shall the main question be put."

All those in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Deavers, to close."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, there's been a lot of rhetoric on both sides and some of it good and some of it bad. And at this time, let's see what the Roll Call will do."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #10 to Senate Bill 1967. All in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, to explain his vote."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm voting 'no' on this because I think as Representative Hill has indicated, in our area, some of industries are already mandating it prior to employment which is all right. You know, the industries that are interested can do that. They're the ones that are



going to be paying for Workmen's Comp. claims if they don't do it; but if we mandate it, we're really doing two things. I think we on the Republican side as conservatives are doing something we always cry about and that is, telling the private sector that they've got to do something. And the other thing we've got to look at is right now in many areas of our state, we have doctor shortages and we're really going to be overloading some of these offices where they're having problems really treating people who are ill. I think we ought to leave it the way it is, permissive."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Mr. Skinner, wish to explain your vote? Mr. Deavers? Mr. Skinner?"

Skinner: "Right, it seems logical to me to allow employers if they wish at their option to pay for medical exams in order to establish a base line of a person's health against which can be compared the person's health through an examination when he decides to make his complaint, a complaint if it every happens. And it seems to me that the Sponsor of this Amendment has said it's optional and if that doesn't direct the course as to whether it's optional or mandatory, legislative intent means very, very little."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 60 'ayes', 100 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion is lost. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, for an announcement that we might be interested in."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now stand in recess until the hour of 8 o'clock and so that the Membership may be apprised of what the plans for this weekend is that the House will be in Session, it appears now, on Saturday. We'll come in at 9 and try to be out of here at 11, but we'll keep the House open all day for messages from the Senate and come back in at 1 on Sunday for a Perfunct. And start the Session about 6 o'clock. So, that is the intention of the Leadership at this time and now I move that the House stand in recess until 8 o'clock."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion to recess



till 8 o'clock, say 'aye'. The 'ayes' have it. The House stands in recess till 8 o'clock."

House stands in recess

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. The Members please be in their seats. Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Garmisa, Chairman from the Committee on Transportation, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 24, 1976. Reported the same back with the following recommendations, do pass, Senate Bill 1691, 1721, 1750, and 2000. Do pass as amended, Senate Bill 1950. Representative McLendon, Chairman from the Committee on Personnel and Pensions, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 24, 1976. Reported the same back with the following recommendations, due pass, Senate Bill 1664 and 1665. Due pass as amended, Senate Bill 1871."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff, for what purpose do you rise? Oh, pardon me. I thought you were Representative Neff. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Taylor, Chairman from the Committee on Cities and Villages, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 24, 1976. Reported the same back with the following recommendations, do pass, Senate Bill 1590, 1786, 1891, and 1591. Do pass as amended, Senate Bill 1798 and 1945. Representative Pierce, Chairman from the Committee on Environment and Natural Resources, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 24, 1976. Reported the same back with the following recommendations, do pass, Senate Bill 1572. Do pass as amended, House Resolution... be adopted as amended, House Resolution 898. Representative Boyle, Chairman from the Committee Appropriations II, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 24, 1976. Reported back with the following recommendations, do pass, Senate Bill 1524, 1581, 1744, and 1956. Do pass as amended, Senate Bill 1712. Representative Lechowicz, Chairman from the Committee on Appropriations I, to which the following Bills



were referred, action June 24, 1976. Reported the same back with the following recommendations, do pass as amended, Senate Bill 1608 and 1932."

Speaker Redmond: "Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has acceded to the request of the House of Representatives for the First Conference Committee Senate Bill 1934, action taken by the Senate June 24, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of Bills following titles, to wit. House Bills 3225, 3332, 3556, 3705, and 3759, passed by the Senate, June 24, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of Bills of the following title; to wit. House Bill 3971, passed by the Senate, June 24, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed Bills of the following title, the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit. Senate Bill 2010 and 2011, passed by the Senate, June 24, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed a Bill of the following title, the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit. Senate Bill 1949, passed by the Senate, June 24, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in passage a Bill of the following title to wit. House Bill 2115, together with Amendments, passed by the Senate as



amended, June 24, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage a Bill of the following title, to wit. House Bill 3376, together with Amendments, passed by the Senate as amended, June 24, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of Bills of the following title, to wit. House Bill 3389, together with Amendments, passed by the Senate as amended, June 24, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of Bills of the following title, to wit. House Bill 3475, together with Amendments, passed by the Senate as amended, June 24, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of Bills of the following title, to wit. House Bill 3494, together with an Amendment, passed by the Senate as amended, June 24, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of Bills of the following title, to wit. House Bill 3822, together with Amendments, passed by the Senate as amended, June 24, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of Bills of the following title, to wit. House Bill 3859, together with Amendments, passed by the Senate as amended, June 24, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred



with the House in the passage of Bills of following title, to wit. House Bill 3952, together with Amendments, passed by the Senate as amended, June 24, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Conference Committee Notices. Representative Bradley, do you seek recognition?"

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I was trying to keep track of what the Clerk was reading in there. Did you read Senate Bill 1934 on a Conference Committee that the Senate did not adopt the Conference Committee on 1934, Jack? You didn't? Okay, fine. Thank you."

Clerk O'Brien: "Notice of Conference Committee appointments relating to Senate Bill 1609. The appointments are Representative Londrigan, Gerald Bradley, Lechowicz, Ryan, and J.D. Jones. A meeting of the Members of the Conference Committee will be Friday, June 25 at the hour of 11 o'clock, a.m. in the East House Corridor. Notice of this posting will be on the bulletin board. Notice of appointment of Members to a Conference Committee relating to Senate Bill 1514. The Members appointed are Representative Schraeder, Gerald Bradley, E.M. Barnes, Ryan, and Totten. A meeting of the Members of this Conference will be Friday, June 25 at the hour of 11:30 o'clock, a.m. in the East House Corridor. A copy of this notice will be on the House bulletin board."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 942, Flinn and House Resolution 941, John Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Dunn sponsors House Resolution 941 and it commends Ms. Marsha Morey for her achievements as an outstanding swimmer. House Resolution 942. by Monroe Flinn commends Lynn Huff, an 11-year-old, for her achievement as a baton twirler. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt the Agreed Resolutions. All those in



favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 937, Totten-Lechowicz."

Speaker Redmond: "Speaker's table. We'll stand at ease for ten minutes."

House at ease.

Speaker Redmond: "We got a gremlin over there sitting in Jim Houlihan's seat. If anybody didn't have a chance to get something to eat, Representative Terzich and Capparelli and Kozubowski. Representative Brinkmeier. Will you turn Representative Brinkmeier on?"

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, I guess I've been a school teacher too long, but we've had a two hour break and I don't see why those of us who have come back on time should be penalized by the late stragglers, so why don't we get started?"

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bill 1545. Representative Kane. Okay. I didn't say any such thing, but if that will make you happy, I'll go back there. Amendment... I'll go right back after this one, Representative Walsh. Is there any trouble with that Amendment, Representative Kane? Or is there any Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 154..."

Speaker Redmond: "As soon as I get through with these three Second Readings, I'll go right back to that one. 1545, Senate Bills, Second on Supplemental Calendar #1. Representative Kane."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, you have all three of 'em? Okay. We got 1543 up there now."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1543. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1544."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1544. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act



in relation to State Treasurer. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1545."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1545. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to state money and the safekeeping of securities deposited with the State Treasurer. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Senate Bills, Second Reading, 1967. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #11, Deavers. Amends Senate Bill 1967 on page 11 by inserting between lines 26 and 27, the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor? Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #11 would require that an individual's Workmen's Compensation benefits be reduced on a dollar by dollar basis by the dollar amount of benefits he receives for a given injury or death from any employer financed pension plan. In Senate Bill 1957 that this is what we call a jackpot benefit and it's a fact that no matter what other benefits that the individual has, that it is not integrated and we're only talking about employer financed pension plans, where the employer pays 100% of it. And I think this is a good Amendment. and it should be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is an Amendment that the National Commission is opposed to. They say that the Workmen's Compensation programs be the primary source of benefits and I have heard on this floor many times that we should follow out the national recommendation. This Commission was set up by President Nixon and they are the ones that reported back on this and I would suggest that you vote 'no' on this



particular Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lundy."

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

Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Lundy: "What does the phrase, 'employer financed' mean? Does that mean a pension or retirement system to which an employer makes a contribution?"

Deavers: "The lawyer makes 100% of the contribution to buy whatever benefit is payable upon retirement, disability, early retirement or any other reason that you may terminate. Under the 1974 Arissa Act, as you know, the federal government tightened this program to the point that at the end of five years, you own 25% of the benefits; at the end of ten years, you own 50%; at the end of fifteen years which is the maximum vesting table that you can use, you own 100% of everything that the employer has contributed in your behalf. All we're asking for here is to stop certain occupations from the fact that you're going to draw 67% under the Workmen's Comp. You get another 33% coming from the pension plan. You're now making 100% of what you were with no deductions and this is the jackpot provision. There's no incentive for the individual to even think about returning to work. And also, the National Commission has encouraged coordination of all benefit programs."

Lundy: "Well, if I may pursue that, I'm looking at the Amendment. I don't see anything in the Amendment that says the employer has to finance 100% of His benefits under the plan."

Deavers: "We're only talking about plans that are 100% employer financed. If you got any other kind of pension plan, it is not integrated."

Lundy: "Can you point out to me the language in the Amendment that says that?"

Deavers: "Line 7, page 1."

Lundy: "It says, 'employer financed'. It doesn't say 100% employer financed. To me, that could include a plan to which



the employer simply made a contribution. For example, a 50-50 contribution with the employee paying the other half."

Deavers: "You're incorrect because under the Arissa Act, anything that the employee contributes is 100% owned by that individual. It cannot be gotten for any other benefit. The employer has no control over anything that an employee contributes."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Lundy: "Well, I do not believe that the Amendment says the same thing that the Sponsor apparently believes that it means. When it says, 'employer financed', that may mean a plan to which an employer makes a contribution. Now, it is true that after a certain number of years as an employee, a beneficiary under a plan may not be divested of his interests in the employers contributions; but that doesn't mean that he should be penalized under Workmen's Compensation for a plan, for receiving benefits under a plan to which he may have made contributions. The Amendment does not say that it has to be a 100% employer financed plan. Indeed, I must say, I've never heard of any such retirement plan that's 100% employer financed. And what you're doing, in affect, if you adopt this Amendment, is to penalize the employee for receiving benefits under a plan to which he's contributed. And a portion of those benefits are simply the money that he's put in during his working career to meet his obligations of the plan. At least, unless the Sponsor can show me differently, that's certainly the way I would read the Amendment and I would urge a 'no' vote on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mautino: "Gil, if I were to give you an example, would you kindly explain to me how this would pertain to your Amendment?"

Deavers: "Yes."

Mautino: "All right. A Teamster Pension Fund is paid 100% by the



employer. Now, Teamsters normally, in the process of getting their pension applied six months before they receive it. Now, let's say the pension program was to be enacted in July. He applied in January. Now, if he... that means he would still be employed by the employer. Now, if he were to be hurt on the job, he would be collecting benefits from Workmen's Comp. Are you then saying that he could not also collect a pension from the Teamsters with this Amendment?"

Deavers: "No, you would... dollar by dollar, we would reduce it. Let's say that he has \$400 a month coming from W.C. and he has \$100 coming under the pension plan. Well, we would reduce the \$400 by the \$100. From that, from W.C. he'd still maintain the \$400. He'd still receive 67% of whatever his benefit was supposed to be. He would not receive 100%."

Mautino: "You mean, that what your Amendment is saying that a man who has a pension coming of \$500 a month and it's going to be due in July. He applies for it and gets hurt on the job in January and receives, for example, \$200 a month in Workmen's Compensation benefits, he'll lose that same amount from his Teamster pension?"

Deavers: "No, because this applies only to disability."

Mautino: "Even if he was disabled? Is that what your Amendment does?"

Deavers: "We're going to reduce it dollar by dollar and that may be the one exception that I'm not familiar with. You got to remember that the disability, I don't know under your Teamster's plan, how long do you have to be disabled before you can draw the benefit?"

Mautino: "Well, at any given time. You know, if you're within the age of 52 and up. It's 100% paid for by employer, but I could see there'd be some great problems with this, Gil, in that particular area."

Deavers: "But it does not reflect retirement benefits. It's only a disability benefit. If the guy retires, then he can no longer collect under W.C. anyway 'cause he didn't get hurt on the job if he's retired, so it won't affect it."



Mautino: "But there's always about a six month lapse between..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your questions to a close, please."

Mautino: "Okay, fine. I'd have to hope that we won't pass that Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I respectfully move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Deavers, to close."

Deavers: "In this integration portion of it, there is no intent in any part of it by the Sponsor to reduce the benefit. All we're trying to stop is the windfall profit or the jackpot provision within the Act. And I move for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #11. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are... Representative Kempiners 'aye'. This question, 41 'aye', 84 'no' and the Gentleman's motion failed. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #12, Deavers. Amends Senate Bill 1967 on page 8 by deleting line 4 through 13 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers. Give the Gentleman order."

Deavers: "Amendment #12 is a recommendation of the National Commission on the Workmen's Compensation. States, 'An employee that refuses to employ his choice of physician, shall be assigned to a physician belonging to a panel of physicians selected and maintained by the Industrial Commission. This panel shall be composed of reliable physicians from every geographical region of the state. An employee refusing the employer's choice of physician is assigned to a physician from the panel who is the closest to him in a geographical proximity.' And I move for the adoption."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, in last year, in 1975 when the House Bill 234 and 235 passed, there were a few points in that Bill that I would say had more salutary affect on clearing up the industrial doctors care differential in the manner in which an injured worker was treated compared to what a private patient was treated around these industrial clinics. I would say that the greatest American dream that you could have is the free choice of your medical care. Now, we have only had less than one year of experience on this kind of free choice of doctor. I would say of all the points of the Bill that passed, this was the most democratic point that passed and the most salutary point that passed because we have now seen in the last year a clean-up of those kinds of medical clinics that truly discriminated between the injured worker and the person who paid privately for medical service. If nothing else, the differential of... and treatment deserves the continuation of that kind of free choice in a free society. Nobody here in this General Assembly would like to be told what doctor they would have to see if they tripped and fell down these stairs and that's what we're talking about. If one of you Legislators fell down these stairs, how would you like to be told that the only doctor you could see is XYZ down the street and if you'll remember correctly, how poor some of those industrial clinics were and how they treated you. I think it's a bad Amendment. We should at least attempt to continue this kind of free choice in the future and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative John Dunn."

J.F. Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If I understood things correctly, the Sponsor of the Amendment says that his Amendment is a recommendation of the National Commission on State Workmen's Compensation Laws. I recommend to you and suggest to you that that is not true, that the National Commission on the State... the National Commission on State Workmen's Compensation Laws says two things. It says, yes, you may have a panel, but it also says that it's



a recommended law if you let the employee chose his own physician. I suggest the statement is this. We recommend that the worker be permitted the initial selection of his physician either from among all licensed physicians in the state or from a panel of physicians selected or approved by the Workmen's Compensation Agency. So, the National Commission suggests you have your choice and I agree with Representative Hanahan that the employee should have his choice. And I think this is a bad Amendment and should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stone."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved the previous question. All those... the question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Deavers, to close."

Deavers: "Gentleman, all we were doing with this one is testing the integrity of the opposition and it is a recommendation of the National Commission and we can find that your sincerity is still self-lacking and your perceptual constancy is remaining static. I move the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #12. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. This question, there's 45 'aye' and 82 'no' and the Gentleman's motion failed. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #13, Deavers. Amends Senate Bill 1967 on page 39, line 12 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, Amendment #13 is also coming from Seat 13 and you're going to be very happy, Representative Hart has one very similar and I'd like to table this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none, Amendment 13 tables. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #14, Hart."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1967 on page 1, line 6 and so forth."

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is the same or very similar to the one that was already adopted on this Bill, so I would move to table Floor Amendment #14."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none, Amendment 14 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #15, Hart. Amends Senate Bill 1967 on page 3 by deleting line 17 through 22 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "This Amendment gives farming operations the option only of being covered under the Workmen's Compensation Act. We've had various attempts to cover or not cover farming operations through the Bill that we passed last year and the Bill that was suggested this year. But it's my feeling and I think it's the feeling of any farmer that they shouldn't be mandated to have Workmen's Compensation insurance. So, this would give them the option of covering or not covering and I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would just like to point out to you what we have already done for the farmers. I have talked and I have heard testimony from the various farm organizations and they were more than happy to adopt by us the idea of 254 man hours or man days or 2,000 man hours. But instead, we have included in Senate Bill 1967, 500 man days in each quarter of the year. That's many, many more times than they requested and consequently, they are more than happy about it. I would suggest that you defeat this Amendment and keep the Bill the way it is, 500 man days in each quarter of the year. That will alleviate all the small farms and just cover the large corporate farms. So it seems to me that you should defeat this particular Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Representative Hart, to close."

Hart: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to challenge Representative Hill



on his statement about this. Really the way the farm, the I.A.A.'s position on this, I think, is that they're willing to accept anything more than what they got last year from the Legislature. So, they're not challenging any suggested improvements on any Bills such as the one that was already put on. But if you really, truly want to take a look at it, there's no excuse if you've listened to the logic of those who speak for labor on the floor of this House, if you've listened to their logic, their logic would be that every employee should be covered at all times. And so, they have apparently exceeded the sum of the farming demands by increasing the number of man hours that makes them exempt. But I say it's better, it's purer, and it's the right way to go to allow the farmer to make the choice of whether or not to be covered under Workmen's Compensation. I personally believe that most of them will elect to be covered because of the fear of being sued for liability in the event that some employee is injured on the farm. Of course, that would be a different theory of recovery, but still the jeopardy would be there and I believe that most farmers would prefer to have the option of being covered and then would elect to be covered. So, I move for the adoption of what I think is an excellent Amendment to this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #15. Those in favor of the motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question.... Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "I had my light on to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote, I'd like to point out that I sat through the hearings in the Senate Committee when the Illinois Agricultural Association's President and all its members that are lobbyists were present. When they stated to the Senate Committee on Industry and Labor that all they requested was the 200 hour a year exemption. Now, the way the Senate in its wisdom has sent the Bill over here is to exempt them up to 2,000 a quarter, four times more than what they ever requested.



And I suggest to the Members of the House to exempt and to exceed by this Amendment any dream, not hope, any dream or nightmare that this Bill will give to the farming interests and not only the farmers, but there's a lot of farm workers out there in those fields. And to provide this kind of exemption from coverage is a bad act, a bad Amendment, and should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers, for what purpose do you rise?"

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I had my light on and I just wanted to explain my vote. I see several people want to vote yet, so I won't do that now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes. Representative Barnes 'no'. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to explain my vote because I want to make it clear that Amendment #15 deletes line 17 through 19 for those of us that are downstaters that are interested in the agricultural community. It takes out the 500 man hours per quarter, so a vote for the agricultural interest in this case for the downstate, small farmer, is a 'no' vote. And I want to change my 'present' to a 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino, record his as 'no'. Representative Kosinski 'no'. Representative Leverenz 'no'. Representative Downs 'no'. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I... my colleague on the Democratic side, Representative Mautino, just made a statement and I would like Representative Hart, the Sponsor of this Amendment, to clarify what was just stated, if he could explain his vote. If a 'no' vote is the proper one for the small farmer, I would reconsider, but I would like that clarified if possible in explaining my vote by Representative Hart."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well, yes. I want to explain it because what this does it applies to all farming operations equally. If any farmer employs



one man, one day and wants to have him covered under Workmen's Compensation, he may do so. But if he elects not to have any farm employees covered under any conditions, whether it's 500 or 200 or whatever it is, that he's not required to do so. But this does not penalize the small farmer, it helps him by giving him the exclusive option of whether or not he wants to run the risk of covering them or to not cover them at all."

Speaker Redmond: "We're going to have to dump this Roll Call. There are some people voted on here that I know are not in their seats and I caution, please do not vote the switch of any Member and I'm referring specifically to the Gentleman sitting in Mr. Jaffe's seat. Do not vote that. Dump this Roll Call. It's on the Gentleman's motion. Representative John Dunn."

J.F. Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation of my vote, we hear that labor is not willing to concede and in Senate Bill 235, which was passed a year ago, the standard was 245 man days of labor during any calendar year. Earlier this week in House Bill 3907, we progressed to 500 man days of agricultural labor per year and now in this Senate Bill, we're at 500 man days per quarter. So, I think we've gone not only the mile, the extra mile and I think that this is another bad Amendment that ought to be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to specifically address what Representative Mautino said. I'd like to explain to downstaters what this really does. It merely permits farmers to elect whether or not to have their employees under Workmen's Comp. Now, let me explain what 500 man days does. 500 man days..."

Speaker Redmond: "Members please be in their seats and be quiet. Sounds like the Notre Dame gym. Proceed, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 500 man days per quarter, Ladies and Gentlemen, says that if you have 2 employees, you will not have to qualify. However, if you hire a couple people



to help you bail hay during the summer, you therefore, go over the 500 man days that quarter, and you then qualify for Workmen's Comp. You then will have to have Workmen's Comp. Now, if you know the insurance industry, they're going to have to take out the legitimate premiums to pay for the possible injuries to those people and you're going to end up paying for that whole year. Representative Hart has a tremendous Amendment. That way, those farmers can elect whether or not to qualify. I repeat again, that if indeed you have 2 employees, they will not have to be worried under Representative Hill's Bill. However, if you hire a couple people for bailing hay, you will qualify and it's going to cost you. I'd urge you to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schunemenen."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my colleague, Dick Mautino, is absolutely right. The language in Senate Bill 1967 as it presently exists is much better for our farmer friends than is this Amendment. It's better from two points. First of all, it would exclude the really small farmer, the man who only has one hired man. It's better secondly from the standpoint that it corrects some language in the old Workmen's Compensation Bill that makes it much more clearer for the farmer as to whether or not he needs to carry Workmen's Compensation. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I'm voting 'no' on this Amendment and I would recommend that my colleagues do the same."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? All voted who wished? Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, what's in a quarter? There's about 133 days in a quarter totally. You're going to take out about 12 Sundays out of that. You're going to have hopefully, a few days of rain. You're going to get yourself down to about 100 working days a quarter. You can work five men 100 days in that quarter under the language of the Bill as it came to us from the Senate. This is more than most average farmers are going to have unless they have a terribly large operation. So, I'd urge you to take the better language that



is in the Bill that came from the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 45 'aye' and 98 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #16, Hart. Amends Senate Bill 1967 on page 3 by deleting line 11 through 14 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Mr. Speaker, I think we should dump that Roll Call. There's some people that have voted that aren't in their seats."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know how we can do it. Had you called it to my attention at the time, I would have, but I don't know how we can do it now."

Hart: "Well, I didn't ask you to dump the first one."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I happened to see my friend, Aaron Jaffe, and somebody was voting his switch and it seemed to me that..."

Hart: "Well, he's in his seat."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, he is now, but I don't know how I can do that now. Amendment #16."

Hart: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment does the same thing for the housewives that my last Amendment tried to do for the farmers. We have passed legislation in 1975 which in the near future is going to require every domestic employee to be covered under Workmen's Compensation insurance. And I say to you that when the housewives of Illinois find out what you've done to them and what extent you've added on to their weekly budget, that you're going to catch a lot of hell and you're going to deserve it because they don't... there isn't any necessity for an occasional cleaning lady or occasional domestic employee who comes in and helps out once in a while to be covered under Workmen's Compensation insurance unless the employer wants to cover that person. So, this Amendment would allow household employees to be covered by the... at the election of the household employer. And I think that this is a people's Amendment and I would ask you to adopt it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."



Schuneman: "A question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schuneman: "Representative Hart, it's my understanding that historically, employers have had the right to elect to cover their employees under the Workmen's Compensation Act. Now, I'm also eager to try to solve the problem of people with domestic employees because I know that that's a serious problem to try to get Workmen's Compensation on those people. But for the life of me, I can't see... can you tell me in what way you're Bill would help solve that problem? It seems to me that you're not giving them anything that they didn't already have under the Act."

Hart: "I'm not giving them anything that they didn't already have before 1975, but I'm eliminating a requirement that they're going to have after 1975. Certainly, any employer could always elect to cover his employees under the Workmen's Compensation Act and that's the way I... that's the way that my last Amendment was written, contrary to the way that you interpreted it and that's the way that this Amendment is written. So, this would go back to the way it was in before 1975 and allow household employers to elect to cover the employees, but not require them to do it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think something should be clarified here. First of all, this Amendment removes all possible coverage from household employees. The way the Bill reads now, the way it reads now, a household employee would not be covered until 1980 and on top of that, they would have to have 40 hours per week for 13 weeks per year. That part is now in the Senate Bill and what Representative Hart is trying to do is to take everything away from a household that employs whether they want to elect or not to elect, the way I understand his Amendment. But the household is not covered until 1980 and then in order to be covered, they would have to work 40 hours per week for 13 weeks per year. Now, on the House Bill, Representative Catania amended that House Bill to move this



particular phase of the Senate Bill back, I believe, to 1977 and that was adopted. The Senate Bill is much more liberal than the House Bill after Susan Catania's Amendment was adopted. I would suggest that you vote in opposition to this particular Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I believe that the Sponsor said that we were only talking about occasional employees. What we're talking about is people who work 13 weeks, at least, in a calendar year, 40 hours a week. These are the household workers that we're talking about when we are discussing Workmen's Compensation coverage. I would hardly describe someone like that as an occasional employee. I think it's totally misleading to imply that this is an 8 hour a week, once every two weeks or so person who comes in to clean the house. We're talking about people who are just as much full-time employees as anybody else. They're only problem is that they get overlooked and left out. They're always the first ones to be thrown out when we're talking about compromise and I think we have an obligation here to remember these people as well as all the other full-time people who are employed, helping the economy in the State of Illinois. I would ask you to vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support this Amendment for substantially the same reason that Amendment #2 was adopted. There is some coverage, some liability coverage afforded domestic help under the typical homeowners insurance policy. Now if you make a requirement whether it happens now or in 1980 or whenever, that they be under the Workmen's Compensation Act and under the exclusion of that policy, there will not be coverage under the homeowners insurance policy and the homeowner is the one who is going to suffer. The insurance companies are the ones who are going to gain. The domestic employee is going to be right about where they are now. So, there's just absolutely no reason, in my opinion,



for not supporting this Amendment. And as Representative Hart said, the wrath of the homeowner will be upon you. You'll feel it very strongly when they have to buy a Workmen's Compensation policy."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, I believe the issue is quite clear. I move the previous question."

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

The question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Hart, to close."

Hart: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the Workmen's Compensation Act as far as household employers is concerned, it's going to provide a trap for many housewives throughout the State of Illinois when they find out or maybe they won't find out that your employees are covered under Workmen's Compensation law, but they don't have any insurance when some of 'em gets hurt. A lot of... people aren't sophisticated about insurance coverage like many of you are on the floor of the House. And when the Legislature imposes liability on those persons and they don't know about it and suddenly they wind up in compensation courts with a suit against them and no insurance and there's going to be a lot of trouble. Now if you're really for the laboring person and if you really want pure coverage or if you want a pure law, there'll be no exemptions provided in this Bill. So, I say that this is a bit of a hoax on the domestic employee to provide this exemption except in certain cases. It's a better procedure and it's a better protection for everybody to let the employer have the option of the coverage. So, I think this is an excellent Amendment. I think it's a people's Amendment. I think it's an Amendment that will save us a lot of headaches in the future and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #16. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Willer, do you seek recognition?"

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly do. If ever there was a



worker in this country who needs coverage of every kind, it's the household domestic. And I'm not a bit worried about the people, the housewives who are going to be wrathful because.... if this is defeated. If you can afford 40 hours a week of a domestic, you can darn well afford to pay Workmen's Compensation. I wouldn't take that job for \$20,000 a year, cleaning someone else's house, unless I was forced to and these are the people who, mostly women, who are domestics, who deserve this sort of coverage. And I really feel that this is a very bad Amendment and, you know, to say that we're going to bring down the wrath of the housewives who can afford 40 hours a week of domestice help is just ridiculous. Who can afford it nowadays?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ron Hoffman."

R.K. Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to take exception to the last speaker. I think it isn't a matter that we're going to bring down the wrath of the... the wrath of the housewives who is no longer in a position to employ these domestics. I think what you're going to have is a situation where there are a lot of housewives that are no longer going to be able to or want to employ these domestics. So in a quest to help a certain category of people, what we're doing here if we do not adopt this Amendment is we're going to put an awful lot of people out of work. There are an awful lot of people that are employed as domestics in the households that opt... are not in a category of affluence. And what we're doing now is putting an additional handicap on those that are seeking employment in this category. So if you're voting 'no' on there, I hope in good conscience you realize that in the middle class range of income, you're going to put an awful lot of people out of work. And when those people, those middle class domestics start calling you as your Representatives, I hope you respond accordingly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

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

I think that Representative Hoffman has put his finger on the problem here in this area very precisely. And I might say that if this Amendment is not...if this Amendment is not put on this



Bill, it's going to mean that in the middle class area of employment here, the average housewife that wants to employ a domestic is going to have to do some bookkeeping and record keeping and so forth that she has never been called upon to do before in her life and if there's one thing that our American housewife resists and doesn't want to get into at this point, in my opinion, is more bureaucratic red tape, filing of reports, keeping of records, logging of hours, and everything else that the government bureaucracy demands and I tell you when the average housewife gets word of this and finds out who imposed this upon her just to employ a simple domestic, she is going to be irate and she is going to be very much concerned about how this came about and who did it to here. I urge an acceptance of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in defense of the housewives who are claimed to have extra work heaped upon them without this Amendment, I would like to inform the male Members of this House who are not acquainted with the situation that any housewife who employs a domestic helper for 40 hours a week already has to keep track of that time, already has to file for social security and other benefits. It will be no additional problem for them to have to take care of this. It's time that we brought our domestic household workers who are full-time workers into the ranks of those who receive some of the benefits and I urge your defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think, Members of the House, that there is one place that we are forgetting and that is our senior citizens. Have you ever thought of the older people that are helping other older people? Do you suppose that they will get insurance from this? I don't believe they could be insured. I think that we will really cause havoc and many more people will be unemployed, unable to get help, all sorts of things. I vote 'aye' on this and I hope you will, too."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one aspect of this subject that has not been covered, I don't think, is this. In a way, unless we adopt this Amendment, we are imposing compulsory insurance on the working woman. And what we're doing if you vote 'no', to some extent, you are padding the insurance companies. I've been an insurance company attorney, maybe I shouldn't be saying this; but what this really is, is this is compulsory insurance. You're saying to the woman who perhaps has stayed and raised her children, been a good mother and housewife and she's gone out into the working world, all of a sudden you're going to sock her. You're going to force her to go out and buy some Workmen's Compensation insurance and that's wrong. Really, the concept of Workmen's or Worker's Compensation began in the factor where there was serious risks and dangers, but to extend this to domestic employees who come in and wash dishes or babysit or perform some other function in the house, is stretching it too far. And I cannot strongly urge you to vote green on this good Amendment to keep the compulsory insurance concept out of the home and out of the housewife and this will benefit the working woman who does not have to pay these high premiums. I urge a green vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm awed at the great concern that certain Members of this House have for the manicured nails of a housewife. I suggest you think a little bit about the sweat of the domestics. I think you have your priorities twisted. An injury to a domestic is every bit as severe as an injury that might happen to anybody else. When you drive a car in Illinois, you pay insurance. That's the name of the game and I suggest that anybody who can hire help for that long simply to keep their nails manicured, then surely can pay a small premium to do justice by a party that might be injured and I suggest that we again, have to examine our own priorities and our own consciences and determine where our true



concern ought to be and I'm proud to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Middle class domestics. A simple domestic. A people's Amendment. Well, a rich people's Amendment, certainly not a poor people's Amendment. I wonder where all those dirty floors are going to go. Where are all those dirty clothes going to go? Dishes just going to stack up or are we going to use paper plates? If anyone needs insurance, it seems to me that domestic workers do. Anybody remember any of those insurance ads about why you ought to have homeowners insurance? Most accidents occur in the home and if you or your wife aren't going to do them, I would suggest the domestic is going to do them. Now, maybe you'd rather have to make her hire a lawyer to sue you to get paid, maybe; but it would seem to me the quasi no-fault system under Workmen's Compensation makes more sense, especially for rich Legislators like my seatmate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well, thank you very much. I would like to say to the Gentleman on my left who assumes that every housewife who employs a domestic sits at home and paints her fingernails, that this also applies to the working mother who hires a babysitter 40 or more hours a week so she can go to work. It isn't every place in the State of Illinois that has day care centers available for all working mothers. And so, the working mothers who hire household help even if they're just babysitters, will have to carry Workmen's Compensation insurance which it makes it much less desirable for them to go to work and to get off the welfare rolls in many occasions. And to those seatmates on my right, the female seatmates who spoke on this Bill, I want you to understand that this gives the option of the housewife to employ, to cover these employees. And to those who claim to speak for labor, but speak impurely about this Amendment, if you're going to cry for the employee, the injured employee, cry for him at the first hour of employment. Don't cry for him after he's worked 1,000 hours in the year because he can be injured and totally disabled whether he works part-time



or full-time and so the coverage should be there at all times. And I think that under the Amendment, most of those who want to, can cover their employees. But we shouldn't require it to be done, certainly domestic employees such as babysitters are not in a hazardous occupation which is defined in the preliminary part of the Bill as being those kind of occupations which are covered under the Act. So I would urge you for your own benefit, for your own protection for the future when this actually comes into play, to vote 'yes' on this very, very good Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't mean to delay these proceedings, but paragraph 18 has got to go one way or another. We might as well let it go by putting on this Amendment because this paragraph is written so badly I don't know those of you who have noticed it, but it's a total of 40 hours for one or more employees and at my house, we've got 7 hours a day, 5 days a week, a little lady coming in babysitting my aged father-in-law and on Thursday, comes in a lady to clean for 8 hours. We're in the 44 hour bracket already and it's all predicated upon someone who's ill in the house and I think if you'll think of your own situations and those of your neighbors, that if you brought in a kid to mow the lawn plus a part-time babysitter plus somebody getting sick for a week or two or three or up to 13, you've got a monumental problem keeping your household going. And if you have, I suggest everybody in Illinois has. Let's adopt this good Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 74 'aye', Representative Hart."

Hart: "I'd like a poll of the absentees and a verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. Please poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jane Barnes, Berman, Brandt, Campbell, Capuzi, Carroll, Craig, Duff, Epton, Ewing, Friedrich, Griesheimer,



Hirschfeld, J.D. Jones, Lauer, Leon, Madison, Marovitz, McAvoy, Merlo, Rose, and Wall."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a verification of the prevailing Roll Call. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, Beatty, Boyle, Gerald Bradley, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Catania, Chapman, Darrow."

Speaker Redmond: "You verify Representative Madigan? Representative Hart? Okay."

Clerk O'Brien: "Davis, DiPrima, Domico, Downs, John Dunn, Dyer, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Gaines, Garmisa, Giorgi, Hanahan, Hill, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Kornowicz, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Londrigan, Lucco, Luft, Lundy, Madigan, Mann, Maragos, Matijevich, McGrew, McLendon, McPartlin, Meyer, Molloy, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Nardulli, Patrick, Pouncey, Rayson, Riccolo, Rigney, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schneider, Sharp, Shea, Skinner, Stone, Stubblefield, Taylor, Terzich, Tipword, Vitek, VonBoeckman, Washington, White, Willer, Wolf, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Luft, for what purpose do you rise?"

Luft: "Mr. Speaker, would you please change me from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'. Any questions of the negative Roll Call? Representative Lechowicz desires to be verified? Representative Hart."

Hart: "Did he vote 'aye' or did he get verified? Mr. Boyle."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boyle in his seat? Take him off."

Hart: "Mrs. Chapman."

Speaker Redmond: "She's here."

Hart: "Mr. Domico."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Domico in his seat? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Hart: "Mr. Downs."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Downs. He in his seat? Remove him."

Hart: "John Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative John Dunn. There his is, up in front."

Hart: "Mr. Dyer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer is here."

Hart: "Okay, Mr. Huff."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Hart: "Mr. Jaffe."

Speaker Redmond: "He was here a minute ago. He's over here."

Hart: "Mr. Kucharski."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kucharski. He's in the back of the room."

Hart: "Mr. Londrigan."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Hart: "Mr. Maragos."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Representative Mudd, for what purpose do you rise?"

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, would you please change my vote to 'aye', please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Friedrich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, would you record me as voting 'aye', please?"

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

Hart: "Mr. McGrew."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Hart: "Mr. McLendon."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McLendon? How's he recorded?"



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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Hart: "Mr. Lucco."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Hart: "Mr. McPartlin."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McLendon's in the back of the hall now. Put him back on the Roll Call. Representative Lucco has returned. Put him back on. What was that last one, Mr. Hart?"

Hart: "McPartlin."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Hart: "Mr. Riccolo."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew has returned. Put him back on. Riccolo is... he's in the chamber."

Hart: "Mr. Schneider."

Speaker Redmond: "Did you put Riccolo back on again?"

Hart: "Well, he wasn't taken off, I don't believe."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider. He's over there."

Hart: "What'd you do about Schneider?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's over there."

Hart: "Mr. Skinner."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "He just came in. That's Mr. Skinner coming down the middle aisle."

Hart: "VonBoeckman."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Hart: "Mr. White."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative White is over on the side.

VonBoeckman is here."



Hart: "Mr. Wolf."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf. Remove him."

Hart: "That's all the challenges that I have."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jim Houlihan is... did you remove him?"

Hart: "No."

Clerk O'Brien: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the tally, Mr. Clerk? 77 'ayes' and 71 'nos'. The Gentleman's motion carries and the Amendment's adopted. What a minute. There's a request. Nobody had made that request. Somebody want to... a request has been made to verify the affirmative Roll Call. Representative... Mr. Clerk, verify the affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "I didn't get the call, what we started with. Now, what was it?"

Speaker Redmond: "77 'ayes' and 71 'nos'."

Hart: "Thank you."

Clerk O'Brien: "Arnell, Beaupre, Birchler, Bluthardt, Bennett Bradley, Capparelli."

Speaker Redmond: "Will the Members please be in their seats. It's impossible to verify. Members please be in their seats. Representative Anderson, please be in your seat. We can't see hear. Representative Ryan, trying to verify and we can't with the crap game in the aisle there. Okay, proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Choate, Coffey, Collins, Cunningham, Daniels, Deavers, Deuster, Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff, for what purpose do you rise?"

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, please vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Gentleman 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ebbesen, Fleck, Friedland, Friedrich, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giglio, Greiman, Grotberg, Hart, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, Hudson, Keller, Kelly, Kempiners, Kent, Klosak, Kosinski, LaFleur, Leinenweber, Leverenz. Luft, Macdonald, Mahar, Mautino, McAuliffe, McClain, McCourt, McMaster, Miller, Mudd, Neff,



O'Daniel."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz." Marovitz."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How's he recorded?"

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

Marovitz: "Please record me 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman 'no'. Representative Merlo,
for what purpose do you rise? I think you're right. Proceed
with the verification. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Schlickman: "The negative have been verified. How you can add
somebody after the verification of the negative?"

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call hasn't been announced. Result has not
been announced."

Schlickman: "But you had a verification of the negative. That
locked the negative in."

Speaker Redmond: "No, sir. Proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Neff, O'Daniel."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman, for what purpose do you
rise?"

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

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

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

Greiman: "Change my vote to 'no', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'no'. Representative
Downs."

Downs: "I presume I was taken off and I'd like to be put back on
as a 'no' vote, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the verification of the Roll Call.
Wait'll we get through with it and then we'll go back."

Clerk O'Brien: "Palmer, Peters, Pierce, Polk, Porter, Randolph,
Reed, Richmond, Ryan, Sangmeister, Schlickman, Schoeberlein,
Schraeder, Schuneman, Sevcik, Simms, Stearney, E.G. Steele,
C.M. Stiehl, Telcser, Totten, Tuerk, VanDuyne, Waddell, Walsh,
Washburn, Williams, and Winchester."



Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Capparelli."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capparelli. Is he in the chambers? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Giorgi: "Representative Choate."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Giorgi: "Daniels."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels is here."

Giorgi: "Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "Ralph Dunn. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Giorgi: "Friedland."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland. He's here."

Giorgi: "Getty."

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

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

Giorgi: "Getty."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Getty here? Remove him from the Roll Call.

Representative Choate has returned.. Representative Choate is over yonder."

Giorgi: "Giglio."

Speaker Redmond: "Put him back on. Giglio. How's he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Giglio's voted 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Giorgi: "Gene Hoffman."

Speaker Redmond: "Gene Hoffman. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Giorgi: "Kelly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly. Representative Kelly here?

How's he recorded?"



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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Giorgi: "Klosak."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Giorgi: "Kosinski."

Speaker Redmond: "Kosinski. He's sitting here."

Giorgi: "Leverenz."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Giorgi: "He's here. Mahar."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar. He's here."

Giorgi: "Mautino."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino's here."

Giorgi: "McAuliffe."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe is here."

Giorgi: "McCourt."

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

Giorgi: "Miller."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's that?"

Giorgi: "Miller."

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

Giorgi: "O'Daniel."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Daniel. He's in the back."

Representative Ralph Dunn has returned. Put him back on."

Giorgi: "Randolph."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Randolph is in his seat."

Giorgi: "Ryan."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Giorgi: "Ryan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan. Is Representative Ryan here?

How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Giorgi: "Sevcik."

Speaker Redmond: "Sevcik. Representative Sevcik in the chamber?"



How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Giorgi: "Stearney."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney is here."

Giorgi: "VanDuyne."

Speaker Redmond: "VanDuyne is here."

Giorgi: "Waddell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell is here."

Giorgi: "Polk, last one."

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

Giorgi: "That's all, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Merlo. Representative Merlo desires to be recorded as 'no'. Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Please change my vote from 'aye' to 'nay'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'nay'. Pierce was one of 'em and Merlo was one of 'em. Representative Maragos. How's Representative Maragos recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is, was removed from voting 'no'."

Maragos: "Please place me back as 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Return the Gentleman to the Roll Call, the negative Roll Call. Any other questions? Representative Fleck, for what purpose do you rise?"

Fleck: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if a person has been verified as 'yes' or 'no' on a Roll Call and they've been verified, how in God's name can they change their vote and be recorded on the other side of an issue?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, the rules say that anytime until the final vote is recorded that they can change."

Fleck: "They've been verified."

Matijevich: "I think the judge ought to look at the rules."

Speaker Redmond: "I believe the only thing in the rules is about verification is once you've been verified..."

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, it says... I would like to feel out a little of Representative Matijevich said, that if it doesn't change the



result. We don't know what the result is and they've been verified on one point. Let's have the result and then they can change."

Speaker Redmond: "I believe that's after it's been verified and the... now the result has been announced; but until the result has been announced, what is the score here? Representative John Dunn. Where's Representative Dunn done? Is he on the Roll Call? Downs. Is he on the Roll Call?"

Clerk O'Brien: "He was removed."

Speaker Redmond: "Return Representative Downs. Representative Gene Hoffman, put him back on the Roll Call. Representative Ryan has returned, put him back on. Representative Boyle has returned, put him back on the Roll Call. Representative Skinner, do you seek recognition?"

Skinner: "Yes, sir. I wish to be noncombatant and vote 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner desires to be recorded as 'present'."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'present'. Wait a minute, what is it? 70 'ayes' and 77 'nos' and the Gentleman's motion fails. The Amendment is not adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #17, Hart. Amends Senate Bill 1967 on page 39, line 7 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't have taken up the time of the House to verify that Roll Call except I think it's time that we found out approximately what the situation is. Now we've got a pretty good, accurate reading of what the House is going to do on this Bill and it'll be interesting to me to see whether or not at some point in the near future, we'll be asked to reconsider the vote by which Mr. Walsh's Amendment was adopted. But in view of the fact that we now have a fairly accurate reading of the outcome of this Bill, I move to table all the other Amendment's which are sponsored by me."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? The Gentleman has moved to table Amendments 17 through 28. Hearing no... Oh, pardon me."



Clerk O'Brien: "17 through 20."

Speaker Redmond: "17 through 20. Hearing no objections, 17 through 20 are tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #21, Skinner-Hanahan. Amends Senate Bill 1967 on page 1 by deleting line 3 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I sense that the Clerk had a question after the joint sponsorship of this Amendment. This is Amendment 21, the Bill that changes one word throughout the Act to change 'workmen' to 'worker' and this is the one for which I was granted leave not to put the printers through their paces and that is why you do not have a copy on your desk. And the reason we did that is because it is 140 pages long. I move the adoption of Amendment 21."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment 21. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #22, Skinner. Amends Senate Bill 1967 on page 1, line 6 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I understand that now someone is going to draw up an Amendment to make it workperson. We're in big trouble. Amendment #21 attempts to do what Representative Deavers said that he was trying to do. It attempts to state explicitly that employers may require an employee to have a medical examination within 10 days after employment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison, for what purpose do you rise?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, is Amendment 22 also 140 pages?"

Skinner: "Isn't this printed?"

Madison: "I don't have a copy."

Speaker Redmond: "It's printed. Proceed..."

Skinner: "I would point out that the Amendment was laid on the Clerk's desk at approximately 8 o'clock this evening, I mean, twenty to,



I'm sorry."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite, for what purpose do you rise?"

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment 25 has been circulated but 22, 23 and 24 have not appeared here."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, would you like to do 25 and then return?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's being circulated now, I take it. How about 23 and 24? May we proceed with 22? Proceed, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "This attempts to do what Representative Deavers Amendment was explained to be. It allows the employer at his option to require an examination within 10 days after employment. The results of such examination along with the results of any physical examination by a physician selected by the employee shall be administered into evidence and taken into consideration..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hill, for what purpose do you rise?"

Hill: "Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate if you would compare Amendment #22 with Amendment #10. Even though Representative Skinner says it is different, it appears as though they are exactly the same."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, in making your examination, if you decide to do so, I hope you will realize that one of them is mandatory and the other is optional which I think is a significant difference. It's like inserting the word 'not'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is not an optional Amendment. The word 'shall' is used throughout the whole thing and I don't agree with the Gentleman's Amendment being an optional type of Amendment. It's almost identical to the Amendment we have addressed ourselves to earlier this evening."

Skinner: "May I suggest that the Gentleman direct his eyes to line 8 where it says that if the employer makes the request, therefore, in writing, that certainly makes it optional rather than mandatory on the part of the employer to tie up all the doctors in the state."



Speaker Redmond: "Have you got the Amendments; Mr. Clerk? The question is whether 22 and 10 are identical. Parliamentarian advises me that in his judgement they are not identical. Representative Stone."

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

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know whether he's finished his explanation. Have you?"

Stone: "Well, he can close then if you'll put the question. He can close."

Speaker Redmond: "Have you finished your explanation of the Amendment?"

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I have been interrupted twice during the attempted explanation. Now, I would like to finish the commentary."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Skinner: "It takes into consideration that the employee may not like to have his physician selected by the employer and may, if planning to have a Workmen's Compensation accident, can get his own medical examination and then these examinations shall be admitted into evidence if there is ever a hearing. I think it is a good idea to allow the employer to have a sort of a base line of an employee's health and that's why I introduced the Amendment and I would ask for the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. The question's on the Gentleman's motion. All those in favor of the adoption of the motion to adopt Amendment #22 indicate by voting 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 44 'aye' and 78 'no'. The motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #23, Hart. Amendment #24, Hart."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart moves to table 23 and 24."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #25, John Dunn. Amends Senate Bill 1967 on page 10 by inserting between parenthesis, so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn."

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



Because of the hour and the fact that Amendment's 25, 26, 27 and 28 are merely technical, clean up language Amendments, at this time, I seek leave to table all four of 'em. That's 25, 26, 27 and 28."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. to table 25, 26, 27, 28. Representative Hanahan. Any further Amendments?"

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm looking through Amendment #21. 140 pages that was represented to me and to Mr. Skinner as only doing one thing and that is changing the word 'workmen' to 'worker'. And on page 53, there is some underlying language that does more than that. And I know we did not have a Roll Call on the adoption of this Amendment, but I'm sure Mr. Skinner and I, both, in compliance with an honorable agreement, did not intend any other language should be introduced in a Bill that was not circulated, 140 pages long. I would suggest that Amendment #21 be tabled due to that... it's an error and I don't believe it's Representative Skinner's fault any more than anyone elses, but the Reference Bureau gave us a Bill with some language in it that should not have been in there and I'd like to, at this time as Co-Sponsor of that, move to table Amendment 21."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fleck."

Fleck: "Well, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "I thought you were on the phone."

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, the Amendment was not passed out. Somehow, the Gentleman from McHenry got a copy of the Amendment. He's talking about language that none of us know about. I wish he would tell us what that new-founded language is and what it does that he's so concerned."

Hanahan: "It's Amendment #21 on page 53 of 140 page Amendment, in Section 7 of the Act, they underline the words, 'except that the amount of compensation which shall be paid for loss of hearing of one ear is 100 weeks'. I don't know the implications, off hand, what it is; but the purported Amendment and the tapes certainly would show, did not affect that Section of



Act in that manner in as the Gentleman, both Skinner and I, see that this was represented in the wrong way, not though his error or mine; but to this House and it should be tabled based on that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I apologize to the Speaker for appearing to look like I can only do one thing at a time. I just called the Reference Bureau and they tell me that this is part of the revisory and that in either Public Act 79-78 or 79-785, the two Bills that we passed last year, somebody had some inconsistent language. Now, I'm certainly willing to strike it on the face because I'm not going to be held responsible for the attempts of the Reference Bureau to clean up mistakes that the General Assembly made last year and I would ask leave instead of tabling the Amendment 'cause you don't know how much work some people down in the Reference Bureau went through to get this stupid thing drawn up. Why can't we just cross out everything in parentheses on line 19, 20, and 21. Then, nobody's got any question that we're changing anything. Oh, excuse me. Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, will you have your colleague..."

Skinner: "...repeatedly, we have..."

Speaker Redmond: "Ask your colleagues to be a little bit more patient, then. Proceed, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Repeatedly, we've been asked what is in those parentheses. Let me tell you, parenthesis, quote, parenthesis, 'except that the amount of compensation which shall be paid for loss of hearing of one ear is 100 weeks', end of parentheses, end of revisionary suggested change by the Reference Bureau."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take a chance cause we didn't see the Amendment. So, I think the proper motion is, and anybody can do it because it was a voice vote, and I think we can wait till next Session to change 'workmen' to 'worker'. So, I'm going to move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment



#21 was adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have several times on this occasion and every year adopted revisionary language out of the Reference Bureau on the Reference Bureau's own word out of their computer. Now, I don't see Representative Katz over there, but he has, on occasion, pointed out to us and, in fact, handled Bills himself with pages and pages of revisionary language. If we can't trust our Reference Bureau to tell us that those few words are merely revisionary, I don't know who we can trust. If indeed there is an error on them, I don't see why we can't have them deleted either by the Clerk or in Conference Committee which we are inevitably going to have. It seems to me that we're making a tempest out of a teapot."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe the Amendment has been distributed. We can't act on something we don't have. We can't amend it on its face. I think it's out of order and I would move to table whatever it is that is allegedly before the body. If it's Amendment 21 or... I would move to table it, period."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh. That's the second motion to table. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what nonsense is going on here. You know, Mr. Speaker, and I would think it would be your obligation to tell the Members that this is what happens all the time, that the Reference Bureau does with any Amendment or any Bill that is written, use revisionary language. The Representative Skinner represented this Bill absolutely accurately.

There's only one thing it does. It changes 'workmens' to 'workers'. That's the only substantive it does. Now, I don't know why these people want to table this Amendment, but it's not for the reason that Representative Hanahan gave you, I'll guarantee you that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."



Madison: "Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that as we listen to Representative Skinner's explanation of Amendment #21, he represented that it did exactly one thing. Now, whether or not the language that has been changed by the Reference Bureau is revisionary or not, seems to me that those of us who are Members of this body had at least the right to know that there was revisionary language in there. We couldn't ascertain that by ourselves because we did not have copies of the Amendment and I don't believe that the change of 'workmen' to 'worker' is so important that we cannot table this Amendment and change that language five years from now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, there's two motions to table and I don't think that's debatable."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, you're correct. Representative Hanahan has moved that... Representative Schlickman, what is your point?"

Schlickman: "Well, the point is simply this, Mr. Speaker. The posture of Amendment #21 is that it was adopted. Now, the only thing that can be done with respect to Amendment 21 is to move to reconsider the vote by which it was adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "I suggest that you look at 62B. It says that an Amendment adopted by a voice vote may be tabled by motion. The time to reconsider is only when you have a record vote and we do not have a record vote there, so you don't know who's voting on the prevailing side. Representative Hanahan has moved that Amendment #21 be tabled and the question is on the motion to table Amendment #21. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 82 'aye' and 50 'no' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Amendment #21 is tabled. Representative Brinkmeier. Wait a minute, state your point."

Skinner: "I wish to ask when it might be in order to strike the Reference Bureau."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, having voted on



the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1967 was adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Any... the question is on the Gentleman's motion. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, you will recall, I was the Sponsor of this Amendment. This is an Amendment that passed by some 15 or 20 votes. It's as good now as it was several hours ago before the Howlett dinner or reception or whatever we broke for. It will be good tomorrow. It will be good forever. Apparently, this is a part of the game tabling Representative Skinner's Amendment. If you will recall just to refresh your minds, this is the Amendment that provided that school kids and other people working around your house..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise?"

Shea: "Is the Gentleman speaking against the motion or objection to it being filed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Will you clarify that, Representative Walsh? What are you doing?"

Walsh: "Would it be proper for me to object to it being filed?"

Shea: "If he objects, I'd say he's out of order. It's perfectly proper motion for a man voting on the prevailing side to file the motion. If he wants to go against the motion, that's one thing; but I will raise a point of order if the Gentleman raises whether the motion is proper or not."

Speaker Redmond: "I didn't think that was what he was doing. I think he was speaking on the motion, isn't that right, Representative Walsh?"

Walsh: "I sure thought I was, too, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, Representative Walsh. Representative Duff, for what purpose do you rise?"

Duff: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it is within your power and your knowledge to understand what is going on on the House floor in a situation like this and we have seen hours of work relative to Amendment..."



Speaker Redmond: "State your point of order."

Duff: "I'm doing so, sir. Relative to substantive Amendments on their merit, including this one. We are now seeing a concerted effort which is recognizable by everybody here to clean all Amendments off this Bill to prevent it going further and, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that this is, all of these motions are out of order as being a negation of the intention of the House up to this time and they are further dilatory."

Speaker Redmond: "It's the opinion of the Chair that any Member has a right to pursue this motion. He voted on the prevailing side and he has asked that that vote be reconsidered and I think it's within his right. Now, is there any other questions on the motion?"

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. Are you through, Mr. Walsh. I have a terrible time with Walsh and Duff."

Duff: "I'll defer to the Assistant Minority Leader."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, again speaking to the motion, I think it was a bit discourteous of the Gentleman not to let me know that he was going to make his motion. As a rule, it seems to me that when an unfriendly motion like this is made, the maker of the motion extends that courtesy to the person who sponsored what that person is trying to undo. But I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, again that this was a very serious Amendment, one that was presented to the Membership of this House in good faith, one that was thoroughly debated and one that the Membership accepted, I'm sure, in good faith. Now, Mr. Speaker, there's absolutely no reason on earth to reconsider this, no good reason on earth to reconsider the adoption..."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order."

Walsh: "Of this Amendment unless you're playing into the hands of some Senator who is so sensitive that he will not have anything happen to his Bill that cannot be improved upon. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, the Bill can improved upon with or without my Amendment."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."

Walsh: "So, I implore you... I'm not through, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Walsh: "Now, you spent two hours at the Howlett affair, Mr. Speaker.

You can give me a couple of minutes here to defend my Amendment, can't you. So, I implore you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to vote 'no' on the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it's a perfectly proper motion. I don't think anybody is being dilatory.. I think the Gentleman's motion ought to be supported and I would hope the Membership would."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, before I address myself to the motion, I would like to ask the Chair how many votes are required to pass this. It's my recollection that a motion to table requires the same number of votes by which the issued passed. Is that correct? In which event, as I recall, it was approximately 83."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I was talking to somebody else, but I understand there's an issue now as to how much it takes and this issue did not take 89. Therefore, the motion to reconsider takes a simple majority."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, it's the vote by which it passed, I think."

Matijevich: "Oh, don't be silly, Brian."

Speaker Redmond: "The Parliamentarian advises me a simple majority."

Duff: "All right, then, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address myself to the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Duff: "And if I could have a little order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll try."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you may recall..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi, for what purpose do you rise?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, to observe the rules again, he already spoke



on this issue."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I have not spoken on this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't believe he did. Proceed, Mr. Duff,
at 10:15."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, because we have been talking about this motion, I would like to recall the Members, the merits and substance of the Amendment that was adopted. This was the Amendment which said that Workmen's Compensation would not apply to the small contractual kinds of obligations that everybody engages in around their home, like somebody that cuts the grass, somebody to clean the gutters, and so forth. It was further pointed out that the personal liability policies apply to these kinds of situations and that they afford in a way that Workmen's Compensation does not to the homeowner, the expenses of his defense. It was pointed out that if we passed this, we take away from the average homeowner and..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley, for what purpose do you rise, at 10:17?"

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I believe the Gentleman is really speaking to the Amendment and not to the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Let him speak within a very limited period of time. Proceed, Representative Duff."

Duff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But I just wanted to point out that this Amendment passed by a significant vote primarily because it does, in fact, protect the average voter in the sanctity and security of his own home and property. And I would seriously... I know what's going on here. There's a political effort to clean this Bill of all Amendments, but in this instance, Ladies and Gentlemen, believe me, you will be making a very, very serious error if we don't keep this Amendment in the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #2 was adopted. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Hart."

Hart: "I just wanted to suggest to the body in explaining my vote that



it would be a very simple procedure to adopt another Amendment to amend the Bill as amended and strike out that objectionable language."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I feel that I would like to explain my vote. I'm very sorry that Representative Walsh feels that I'm dilatory and that I haven't been courteous to him. I think if he'd check the record, he'd find that both in Committee and on the floor of this House, I voted many times to try to do a little bit more than we're doing with this Bill. I'm not satisfied. I don't think this goes far enough and I want the record to show that, but I've been in politics long enough to know that half a loaf is better than none or even a quarter loaf as this may very well be, but I happen to believe that this would be necessary to get this Bill passed, at least give a little relief to the business community and that's why I made the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 73 'aye' and 86 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1613. Senate Bills, Second, 1613."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1613."

Speaker Redmond: "No, it's on the Regular Calendar. Representative Madison, are you ready to proceed on 1613?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amends Senate Bill 1613 on page 6 by deleting line 8 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Amendment #1 was a Committee Amendment offered by Representative Barnes and I yield to Representative Barnes for an explanation of the



Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Committee Amendment #1 reappropriates \$8,500,000 for fiscal '76 federal funds for the payment of claims received after the last period but which was not processed against fiscal '76 appropriations. This Amendment incorporated within the current fiscal appropriation the language in which was desirable and which the Comptroller desired to have put there and that is the purpose of Amendment #1. I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1795, Representative Hart."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1795. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Supreme Court to pay for certain officers in a judicial system. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 lost in Committee, Committee Amendment #2 amends Senate Bill 1795 on page 1 by inserting immediately after line 23, the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Amendment #2 was adopted in Committee and it adds \$1.7 million for the state to pay 100% of the Circuit and Associate Judges salaries and I move for the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well, I'd like to ask Mr. Ryan... Mr. Ryan. Could I have your attention a minute?"

Ryan: "Certainly, undivided."

Hart: "Thank you very much. The Supreme Court, the court administrator suggest that he has no opposition to this Amendment, but if we're going to do this, it should be spread throughout the Bill instead of added in the way that you did it. So, I have filed a substitute Amendment which will be Amendment #3 or 4 which actually puts it in the Bill in proper... in a proper



way and I would ask that you table this Amendment and adopt Amendment #4 which adds the money but spreads it throughout the Bill where it belongs."

Ryan: "Could we see a copy of that Amendment?"

Hart: "Well, it was... if it hasn't been circulated, then the Bill should not be considered at this time. I thought it had been because I filed it several hours ago and I think that it has."

Ryan: "Is this the same Amendment for the same amount of money?"

Hart: "Well, it's the same amount of money, but it amends certain lines to add the proper amounts in the proper placings rather than just to add it in a lump sum as you've done with your Amendment."

Ryan: "#4 is my Amendment, Representative Hart. Do you know what number yours is?"

Hart: "Well, it's the last one filed, I believe."

Ryan: "Can you give us a minute?"

Hart: "Certainly. I'm advised it's Amendment #7."

Ryan: "Well as I understand it, Representative Hart, the lump sum as we've put it in in my Amendment #2 earmarks it specifically for that. Do you understand it to be that way?"

Hart: "Yes, but actually I don't think it was enough money. ^{now} that I've looked at it, The explanation is that it requires \$2,010,000 for Circuit C; \$96,000... 96 judges-Cook and DuPage County, \$720,000; Circuit A, Cook County and DuPage County, that's Associate Judges. There's 79 of them. We require \$592,500 and Associate Judge Magistrates in Cook County-\$175..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder, for what purpose do you rise?"

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there's a colloquy going on here. Why don't we take that out of the record and get on to some other business and let 'em work out their problems. We've been near on ten minutes on that and they still don't know where they're going."

Ryan: "I don't have any problems, Representative Schraeder."

Hart: "Yeah, we can work it out."

Speaker Redmond: "Can it be worked out here? The problem is that



this is necessary for the operation of state government and I'd like to get it in a posture to pass it."

Hart: "I'm in agreement."

Ryan: "Well, Representative Hart, we got Representative Barnes here. We'd like to have some time to talk about this. I don't know whether you want to take it out of the record, come back to it or not."

Hart: "I'd be perfectly willing to take it out of the record if that's your request."

Ryan: "Representative Barnes, who is the... your guy on Appropriations II, and I both feel..."

Hart: "He's my guy on any Committee or at any time."

Ryan: "We should... we should go ahead and pass this Amendment, put it on and then we'll talk about it."

Speaker Redmond: "What's your pleasure, Representative Hart?"

Hart: "I'd rather take it out of the record than adopt the wrong Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, take it out of the record. On Senate Bills, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1804. Representative Schuneman. Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 1804 was moved to the order of Third Reading this morning and there is an Amendment that should be offered and I would ask leave of the House to take it back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's..."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "I ask leave to take Senate Bill 1804 back to the order of Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. 1804 returned to the order of Second Reading. Will you break up the crap game in the Republican aisle here? You'd better not take any chances in playing cards with those guys. Representative Schuneman."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Amends Senate Bill 1804 on page 1, line 1 and 5 and so forth."



Schuneman: "Representative Catania is the Sponsor of this Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania. Is she on the floor? Representative Kane."

Kane: "I don't think this Amendment has been distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, since... I think I can explain the Amendment and I don't believe it's controversial, Mr. Speaker. Can we proceed on that basis?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, explain the Amendment."

Schuneman: "Yes, Senate Bill 1804 is a Bill that originated in the State Employees Group Insurance Commission. Was brought to our attention that the statute provides that under our group insurance program that if a husband and a wife are both employed by the State of Illinois, they must insure their children under the insurance of the male employee. And the statute does not provide for insuring the children under the insurance of the female employee which sometimes is in desire, which sometimes is desired. Now in actual practice, the State Employees Group Insurance administrators has been insuring either under the male or female employee, but this Bill would merely make that practice legal and I would urge the adoption of the Amendment. There's no objection on the part of the State Employees Group Insurance Commission, so I would urge adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1804."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1804. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 3588."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3588. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "I would ask leave to return House Bill 3588 to Second Reading."



Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has.... is there any objection to moving Senate Bill 3588 to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment? Hearing none, it will be returned to the order of Second Reading. Representative Kane."

Kane: "I'd yield to Representative Terzich."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, we adopted Amendment #2 which made some corrections with regard to the contractual employees coming under the pension program. And after speaking to the Employees Retirement System, we find that this would cause some problems; and so therefore, I move that we table Amendment #2 to take the necessary action to reconsider."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Yes, I have a question. When you say contractual employees, does that mean our home office secretaries or something, Mr. Terzich?"

Terzich: "Yes, what happened is that there were some secretaries that were not able not able to get on the plan because of the accounting system and after discussing this with the State Employees Retirement System, they're going to try to handle this administratively."

Grotberg: "This will not prevent them from sharing in the retirement or not?"

Terzich: "No, it will not."

Grotberg: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Is there any objection tabling Amendment #2 to House Bill 3588? Hearing none, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield? You state that the State Employees Retirement System had an objection to Amendment #2. What was the objection?"

Terzich: "Well, the problem was that when the Bill was enacted, that there were substantial number of people who claimed to be on contractual services such as doctors and things of this nature and it just left open an influx of people coming in under that system."



Schlickman: "And your intention with respect to Amendment #2 was to have it to apply to only contractual employees of Legislators, is that correct?"

Terzich: "That's correct."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Hearing no objections, Amendment #2 is tabled. Third Reading. 3604. 3604, yeah."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3604. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide insurance for employees. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask leave to return House Bill 3604 to Second Reading for the purpose of tabling Amendment #5 and adding three Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none, House Bill 3604 will be returned to the order of Second Reading. Is there any... Representative Kane, Representative Schuneman."

Kane: "Representative Mautino, we need to table one Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 to House Bill 3604 was adopted by a voice vote. I now move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #5 was adopted. Then, I would move to table Amendment #5 to House Bill 3604 in lieu of Amendment 9 which will be offered by Representative Schuneman."

Speaker Redmond: "Was a voice vote?"

Mautino: "Yes, sir."

Speaker Redmond: "I believe the proper procedure would be to move to table Amendment #5. The Gentleman's moved to table Amendment #5. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #5 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amends House Bill 3604 as amended."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3604 also pertains."



to workmen's compensation insurance and would establish a new assigned risk pool arrangement which I think will be very helpful in solving some of the problems that we've been having in placing workmen's compensation insurance. Amendment #7 provides that the Commission shall promulgate regulations and offer to employers and installment premium plan for annual premiums in excess of \$1,000. The problem, Mr. Speaker, under the present arrangement has been that some employers who have had insurance through the voluntary market and now are being forced to go into the assigned risk pool, were formerly offered installment premiums, methods of premium payment; but the present assigned risk plan provides for no installment payment of premiums and Amendment #7 would make that provision in House Bill 3604. I would move the adoption of Amendment #7."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, if the Sponsor would yield for a question."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Deuster: "This, I thought you said, Representative Schuneman, that this Amendment was going to establish an assigned missed risk plan, is that correct?"

Schuneman: "No, sir. That is not correct."

Deuster: "Okay, has this Amendment been considered in Committee?"

Schuneman: "No, it was not."

Deuster: "And then if doesn't establish the assigned risk plan, I'm sorry to ask you to repeat, but what does it do?"

Schuneman: "I explained earlier that House Bill 3604 would revise and establish a new workmen's compensation assigned risk plan. That Bill was heard by the Labor and Commerce Committee and was passed out of Committee. One thing that the Committee did not discuss and I think should be a part of this Bill is the provision for employers to pay their premium in installments rather than having to pay all of the money at the front. Some employers are required to pay premiums in the thousands of dollars and in the voluntary market, they're able to pay those premiums from some kind of an installment basis. All this would do would be to make an installment premium plan available to them in the assigned risk



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

pool."

Deuster: "All right, thank you."

Schuneman: "So I think..."

Deuster: "Sorry, I misunderstood your Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Mautino."

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

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

The question is shall the main question be put. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

Representative Schuneman, to close."

Schuneman: "I would just ask for a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt

Amendment #7. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #8, Kane. Amends House Bill 3604 on page 2, line 24."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #8 is simply a technical Amendment cleaning up some typographical errors that were caught by the Enrolling and Engrossing Committee and I'd move the adoption of Amendment #8."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #8. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #9, Schuneman. Amends House Bill 3604 on page 2, line 21 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #9 is a substitute for Amendment #5 which was tabled by Representative Mautino. Amendment #5 would provide for the payment of insurance commissions to agents and brokers under the assigned risk Workmen's Compensation Bill and it was found after that Amendment was adopted that there were some problems in the industry in that the level of commissions was, perhaps, too high for some parts of the industry.



Amendment #9 would simply say that a commission shall be paid and that the rate of commission shall be established by the Industrial Commission and the Director of Insurance shall hold hearings to determine an equitable rate of commission and I would move the adoption of Amendment #9."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Schuneman: "Yes."

Geo-Karis: "Does your Amendment differ from House Amendment 6 that's already been passed? I mean 5, I mean. It's 5 I'm talking about. No, no, no, I mean 6. 6, I'm talking about 6."

Schuneman: "No, I think you mean 5."

Geo-Karis: "No, 5 you took off, but Amendment 6 is still on the Bill, is it not?"

Schuneman: "Yes, it does..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane, for what purpose do you rise?"

Kane: "Amendment #6, Representative Geo-Karis, has to do with granting binding authority to a licensed insurance agent. It doesn't have anything to do with the payment of commissions."

Geo-Karis: "Well, if I recall correctly, we passed an Amendment relative to the..."

Kane: "That was Amendment #5 which has been tabled."

Geo-Karis: "You tabled Amendment #5, is that right?"

Kane: "Yes."

Geo-Karis: "And now is Amendment #9..."

Kane: "Replaces Amendment #9."

Geo-Karis: "Would the Sponsor of this Amendment tell us what it's about instead of all the din over here where I can't hear a thing?"

Schuneman: "Well, I just finished explaining it, Representative, but I'll try once more."

Geo-Karis: "I couldn't hear you."

Schuneman: "Amendment #5 was specific as to the amount of commission to be paid."

Geo-Karis: "Right."

Schuneman: "Amendment #9 simply says that the Director of Insurance shall hold hearings and promulgate a schedule of commissions



which would be found to be equitable."

Geo-Karis: "Okay, thank you."

Schuneman: "And would probably reduce in a lower rate of commission, result in a lower rate of commissions than were provided in Amendment #5."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #5, 9. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bill 1795."

Clerk O'Brien: "This Bill has been read a Second time previously."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Clerk O'Brien: "We were on Amendment #4. Representative Ryan's Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. After some discussion with Representative Hart and the staff, I am going to move for the adoption of Amendment #4. No, I think you got the wrong Amendment up there, Mr. Speaker. We were... we took the Bill out of the record, I thought, was on Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "That was my memory."

Clerk O'Brien: "You're right."

Ryan: "Yeah, that was a Committee Amendment. This Amendment added the \$1.7 million as I said to pay for the state to pay the 100% for the Circuit and Associate Judge's salaries. And we feel the Amendment as drafted, specifies in lines where that money goes and so, we're going to stay... at least try and put it on and would ask for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Mr. Speaker, I would oppose this Amendment. What this Amendment would do would be to pay the complete salaries of all the judges throughout the state if the House Bill that we passed the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

other day to require that was enacted into law and signed by the Governor. Now, last year we passed a similar Bill and it was vetoed by the Governor and I doubt in the first place that this Bill will get out of the Senate. In the second place, he'll probably veto it again. So, I think the proper way to handle this is to leave this money out of the Bill and then in some event this Bill becomes law, we can have a supplemental appropriation later on to pass the needed money. It will probably be less money than this because all the vacancies won't be filled and so we probably won't need all this money. But if we put this Amendment on at this time, the likelihood is that we'll tie the money up and then have to lapse it and I would prefer that we don't do it and the Amendment be defeated."

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

Ryan: "I would just renew my motion, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1795. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Motion fails. Lost, motion fails. Any further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Committee Amendment #3, lost in Committee. Floor Amendment #4, Ryan. Amends Senate Bill 1795 on page 1, line 20 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan. Is somebody bothering Representative Ryan on Amendment #4?"

Ryan: "Well, I don't know, Mr. Speaker, if I ought to try this again or not. Amendment #4 reduces \$1.1 million from the judicial salaries based on their estimated lapse. Each year they lapse a little over a million dollars and we feel this money is not needed in there and I would move for the adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Mr. Speaker, I also oppose this Amendment. This is just guesswork on the part of the Gentleman that's offering the Bill. There's no way to know how many vacancies there are or are not going to be filled, and so the Amendment is figured... that... rather much taken out of the air. The money should stay in the



Bill and I urge the defeat of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Ryan, do you care to close?"

Ryan: "I'll try again, Mr. Speaker. The judicial system has always experienced large lapses of funds. In 1975, through the four salary line items, Circuit Judges and Associate Circuit Judges and so forth, they lapsed between 26 and 36%. And so I think this line for fiscal '76, the estimated lapse for these four line items alone is going to be about \$1.6 and that's with the Governor's veto of \$2.7 from the amount that we approved for these line items, and so I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #4. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the motion is lost."

Ryan: "Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 61 'aye' and 78 'no'. The Gentleman's motion is lost. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Barnes. Amends Senate Bill 1795 on page 9 by adding immediately after line 20, the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a very simple Amendment. What this Amendment does is put the rate of payment of funds involved in the payment of O.C.E. for the judiciary back to where it's always been. It's always been a 75/25 split between general revenue and the road fund and this Amendment will simply be in keeping in the fashion in which these funds have always been utilized at, and I would move for the adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Reluctantly, Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose Mr. Barnes' Amendment. This Amendment was offered in Committee and was defeated and there's no way in the world that we can do that at this time and I urge the Membership to defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the adoption



of the Amendment. Those in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Hart. Amends Senate Bill 1795 on page 9, line 26."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you. This is merely cleanup language. It changes the word 'Section' to 'Act' because it is an Act and it's not a Section and I urge the adoption of this. It's necessary to put this change of word in there so that the Bill can be statutorily correct."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #6. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The motion carries. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

Hart: "I move to table."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #7. Any objection? Hearing none, Amendment 7 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading."

Speaker Shea: "On the order of House Bills, Second Reading appears House Bill 1936. Senate Bill 1936 on the order of Senate Bills, Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1936. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Capital Development Board. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Shea: "You don't want to take that? All right, take it out of the record. Mr. Stone, did you get 1650 done today? All right, on the order of House Bills, Second Reading... Third Reading, House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 1650. Senate Bill 1650, my mistake."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1650. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois



Community College Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Shea: "Representative Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the appropriation for the operation of the Illinois Community College Board for their ordinary and contingent and distributive expenses for the year 1977. It appropriates \$135,156,862 and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Senate Bill 1650. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner; "Yes, could you tell us how much is going into the special equalization pot this?"

Stone: "I'm sorry, I can't, Mr. Skinner. I can get the information for you."

Skinner: "Is it up, down, sideways?"

Stone: "At the moment, I can't even give you that information."

Skinner: "Well, I'd like to know."

Stone: "I'll get it for you."

Speaker Shea: "Is there any further discussion? Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

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

Speaker Shea: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Is it true that the appropriation in Senate Bill 1650 for fiscal year '77 is approximately eight and a half million dollars over the Governor's budget and nearly \$21.7 million over the fiscal year '76 appropriation?"

Stone: "The appropriation is for approximately \$135,000,000. The Governor's request was just over \$126,000,000."

Schlickman: "May I ask another question, Mr. Speaker? You've conceded that the appropriation is \$8.5 million approximately over the Governor's budget. Would you also concede that it's \$21.7 million over the appropriation for the present year?"

Stone: "I gave you one wrong figure, Gene. The actual amount, it was amended down to \$132,000,000 instead of \$135,000,000. So, it's nearly exactly \$6,000,000 more than the Governor recommended."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Schlickman: "And how much is the appropriation over fiscal '76?"

Stone: "All right, '76 was \$113,000,000. It's now \$132,000,000."

Schlickman: "So we're talking about a \$19,000,000 increase?"

Stone: "Yes, I would, however, point out to you that the Junior...
or the Community College program is relatively new in the State of Illinois. We're still in an expansion stage. The cost per student or the amount being appropriation per student is less than it was last year because the enrollments are climbing at an enormous rate."

Schlickman: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "I haven't moved, Mr. Speaker, but I'm from DeKalb."

Speaker Shea: "It's DeKalb, I'm sorry."

Ebbesen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know we're anxious to get this Roll Call and it's late, but I'd just like to add... make an observation and it was brought to our attention that this appropriation's up twenty-some millions dollars and in my opinion, looking at government itself and dollars we spend, when it comes to the Community Colleges, the people of this state are not... they're getting the most for their money in services and capital improvement than any dollars we spend and I think it's a very minimal increase and it probably should be more. Just an observation."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Stone, to close. Mr. Stone, to close."

Stone: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I would appreciate your favorable vote. The question is shall all those... shall Senate Bill 1650 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all those voted who wished? Have all those voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this, there are 144 'ayes', 4 'nays'. Senate Bill 1650 having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1938. On the last Roll Call, Madison 'aye'. McMaster 'aye' on the last Roll Call. Polk 'aye' on the last Roll Call. Mr. Stone, are you ready to go on 1938?"

Stone: "Yes, sir."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1938. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Board of Trustees of State University Retirement System. Third Reading of the Bill."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, Senate Bill 1938 appropriations \$792,100 from the State Pension Fund to the State University Retirement System. Now, this is an automatic thing that we have to pass every year in order to get these funds to the proper system and I would appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Shea: "Discussion? Discussion? The question is shall Senate Bill 1938 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 152 'ayes', no 'nay', 1 Member voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1938 having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 3989. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3989. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Veteran's Affairs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a large, very large appropriation of \$5,000. It is for... I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Shea: "Is there debate? The question is shall House Bill 3989 pass. Oh, now Mr. Ryan wants a question."

Ryan: "Well, it may be a very large appropriation of only \$5,000, Mr. Speaker, but I certainly believe everybody in the chamber ought to know what the \$5,000 is for and I would ask for an explanation."

Maragos: "I'd be glad to, Mr. Minority Spokesman of the Appropriations II Committee, whose Committee this Bill passed. Is a fact that what this is for, the memorial of the... all the Illinois Veterans who have received the Medal of Honor and this is perpetual care of the grove in Valley Forge. It's a freedom foundation grove and our state has a monument there for all these veterans who've received the highest award the



country can give during time of war and it's... that we should give it before... during this year of the Bicentennial which is going to be... this grove is going to be given to the country in July 4, 1976. And I think it's appropriate that our state become updated in its obligation which was passed in 1967."

Speaker Shea: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Shea: "Yes, he will, sir."

Duff: "Is somebody from Illinois going to take that to Philadelphia?"

Maragos: "No."

Duff: "Why doesn't our Member who is a Congressional Medal of Honor winner take it?"

Maragos: "I'm sure we can make arrangements that he could go and we'd be glad to because he did not want to become a member... I mean, a Sponsor of this particular Bill because he had a conflict of interest."

Duff: "Well, it just seems to me, Mr. Speaker that it would be unseemly for us to pass this appropriation without acknowledging the fact that one of our Members is a Congressional Medal of Honor winner."

Maragos: "Well, I think, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we all are aware of our esteemed colleague who is, who has received this high award in this nation and that was one of the reasons I... when I found out that we needed a \$5,000 more for an obligation which the State of Illinois undertook in 1967, that we should fulfill our obligation and honor not only our esteemed colleague, Mr. Choate, but many others who have fought and who have earned this award."

Speaker Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 3989 pass. All those in favor will say or vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Take the record. On this question there are 150 'ayes', no 'nays'. Mr. Ryan, for which purpose do you seek recognition, sir?"

Ryan: "Well, you go ahead and announce the Roll, Mr. Speaker. I'd



like to question the Chair."

Speaker Shea: "150 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 Member voting 'present' and House Bill 3989 having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. For what purpose do you rise, Mr. Ryan?"

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, it is now 11 p.m. Most of us have been here about 12 hours. You're talking about several million dollars worth of expenditures and for one, I think it's wrong that we have to sit here at this hour after we've been here this long to talk about this kind of money and I would move for adjournment at this time."

Speaker Shea: "Well, you're not recognized for that purpose, sir. On the order of motions appears on the Supplemental Calendar, on motions appears House Resolution 937. And on that question the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My motion on House Resolution 937 is to move for immediate consideration of the Resolution. And if I can on the motion, Mr. Speaker, how... Senate Bill 1600 which is the Department of Revenue's appropriation has been sitting on Third Reading for some time. It has been sitting at the request of the Chairman of Appropriations and myself regarding practices used by the Department of Revenue in bid procedures on the instant lottery tickets. The Chairman and I have requested repeatedly information regarding the bid procedures. To this day, there's been much papers shuffled between the Department of Revenue and ourselves and many of the questions are unanswered. At this time, the Comptroller has indicated that because of bid procedures that he will not honor the voucher for payment of instant lottery tickets which may have been in violation of the present Illinois Purchasing Act as it extended a contract that expired..."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Totten, this takes 89 votes to get to consider the motion immediately because it's on the Calendar. 107 and so you move and Mr. Lechowicz wishes to speak in favor of it, so all those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote



'nay' so we can get to the Resolution. It takes 107 votes. Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 132 'ayes', 5 'nays' and 5 Members voting 'present'. The... Rule 41 is suspended for the immediate consideration of the Resolution. Proceed, Mr. Totten, on House Resolution 937."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My request on the motion was so that we could proceed to get the Senate Bill on the Department of Revenue moved off the Calendar. As I'd indicated, we have as yet been unable to have the questions answered. The Comptroller has refused to pay a Bill for \$250,000 that may have been in violation of the Purchasing Act. In addition, bid specifications which have been redrafted still apparently do not provide for more than one bidder to bid on such a large contract. The Department indicated in testimony before the Committee that if other vendors had been able to participate in bidding on this contract it may have saved the state close to a half a million dollars. We have as yet really been unable to determine what the instant lottery... what the instant lottery tickets will be next time, who will be able to bid on them, whether anyone else will be able to bid on 'em and whether the state can save more money. Because these questions have been unanswered at this time, I've prepared and introduced House Resolution 937 which directs the Auditor General to conduct a management audit of the policies, practices, and procedures adopted or utilized by the Department of Revenue in the procurement of instant lottery tickets. The Resolutions directs that the audit shall be... look into specifications, procurement policies, practices and procedures in order to assure that state monies have been used for the benefit of all the people of the State of Illinois and not in violation of certain statutes that exist in this state. And Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move for the adoption of House Resolution 937."

Speaker Shea: "Is there debate? Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as the principal Sponsor of Revenue Department's appropriation Bill 1600, I'm in full accord with this



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Resolution. I think it should be passed for good government, expenditure of money in the proper fashion. I would certainly support this wholeheartedly."

Speaker Shea: "All right, all those in... for what purpose does the Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, seek recognition?"

Cunningham: "I wanted to inquire of the Sponsor, couldn't the Auditor General conduct this without any such Resolution? I didn't ask you."

Totten: "Mr. Cunningham, I'm not certain of that. We have directed in the Resolution that he commence the audit immediately so we can find the answers that have not been given to the Appropriations Committee or the Members of this House."

Cunningham: "Let me speak for ten seconds. Common sense indicates that the Auditor General can make the audit. If he can't, what's the purpose of having an Auditor General. This is the doing of an unnecessary act."

Speaker Shea: "The question is shall House Resolution 937 pass. All in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the Resolution passes. Mr. Matijevich, do you think we need 89 votes?"

Matijevich: "The rules say where the Auditor General makes an investigation, you need 89."

Speaker Shea: "All right, all in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 140 'ayes', 2 'nays', 2 Members voting 'present'. House Resolution 937 having received the requisite amount of votes is hereby declared passed. Mr. Schneider on the floor? He was a minute ago. Mr. Schneider, on the order of Concurrences appears House Bill 3147 which I understand you want to nonconcur in. Is that correct? You want to nonconcur in it now? On the order of Motions appears Senate Bill 1651. Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have a motion to discharge the Committee on Higher Education and advance Senate Bill 1651 to the order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. This is a substantive Bill which provides for the spending of



the money that we just appropriated in Senate Bill 1650 for the operation of the Junior Colleges and provides for the manner in which it is to be spent. I have checked with Representative Mann and he... the Committee on Higher Education is not having any more meetings and he does not have any objections to this motion and I would appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Shea: "Does the Gentleman have leave to amend it on its face to read Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Is there objection? Hearing none, the motion will read. Now, on the motion we're under the rule where one person will speak for it and one against. Mr. Skinner, do you wish to speak as an opponent?"

Skinner: "Well, until we know what the devil's in it why don't we let the proponent speak and try to tell us what's in the Bill?"

Speaker Shea: "I thought he just did, but, Mr. Stone, do you want to..."

Stone: "Yes, I'll be pleased to do this. The money for Junior Colleges in the past has been... has set a statutory minimum of \$17.61 per credit hour and that is the way the money has been spent. There's a blue ribbon appointed by the... all of the Community Colleges and they came up with the new formula that in the case that the average for credit hour grants should be the average should be no less than \$17.61, but that the... now there are 8 classifications and the rates for each classification is more or less than others, but the average is still \$17.61. For example, health technology would allow \$31.01 and vocational skills, for example, would get \$13.96. The average would still be the same except that it's divided in a different way. This was approved by the various Community College Boards, by the State Community College Board and by the Board of Higher Education. In other words, another thing, another reason we must have this Bill is if we leave it like it was so that the rate would be \$17.61 regardless of the kind of course it was, it would take an additional \$10,000,000 from the State of Illinois to meet the requirements. So, Senate Bill 1650 would not be for enough money."



Speaker Shea: "All right now, is there an opponent? Mr. Matijevich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Matijevich: "I'm really not an opponent and I've heard the Chair say that we can suspend the Joint Rule by unanimous consent.

I don't think we can do it. I still think you need three-fifths from both Houses to do it."

Speaker Shea: "Well, whereabouts are we?"

Matijevich: "I thought he was trying to discharge Rules Committee."

Speaker Shea: "No, no, it's... there are three motions on there and I've called the third one."

Matijevich: "Oh, I'm sorry."

Speaker Shea: "Which is to take it from the Committee on Higher Education. All right now, is there an opponent? Mr. Skinner, do you want to speak to it?"

Skinner: "I'm not proud. If you want to call an opponent, I'll be happy to be an opponent to get to ask a question or two. How much did the... if the Gentleman will yield to a couple questions. Will he?"

Stone: "Yes, yes, sir."

Skinner: "Okay, how much did we give per credit hour to academic hours last year?"

Stone: "They were all the same, \$17.61 per hour except that the state didn't pay the full amount so that much was not actually paid."

Skinner: "All right, could you tell me how much they actually got?"

Stone: "No, I cannot."

Skinner: "How much are they going to get next year?"

Stone: "The same amount, \$17.61 except that it will be divided in a different way."

Skinner: "All right, what's somebody that's taking a course in history or mathematics going to get reimbursed, what will the college get reimbursed for their..."

Stone: "There are eight classifications, baccalaureate and academic, business and public service, data processing and commerce technology, natural science and industrial tech., health technology, vocational skills and general studies. And the rate for each one



is different. I would assume that your question would fall under general studies and be..."

Skinner: "No, probably in the first one-baccalaureate."

Stone: "Baccalaureate-\$18.87 which is slightly more than the \$17.61."

Skinner: "What will it do to remedial developmental programs?"

Stone: "What classification is that under? Health technology?"

Skinner: "I am informed that it is called remedial developmental.

Another Member of the Appropriations Committee says I am correct, that that is indeed what it is called. Can you tell what that will be per credit hour?"

Stone: "No, sir."

Skinner: "Well, it sure sounds to me like this needs Committee work if we don't even know the basic answers to how much is going to go out for each type of program. I know that the Junior College Association is cued toward the more sparsely populated Junior Colleges and if it does anything to the special education thing as it does, we doubled... not special education, the special equalization program. Last year, we had \$3,000,000 pumped into that. This year we're doubling it to \$6,000,000 and if I remember correctly, that meant that every Junior College that was not one of the recipients was losing about 42 cents per credit hour under the \$3,000,000 and now we're up to probably 84 cents to a dollar for credit hour that we're subsidizing Junior Colleges and that are very sparsely populated and I just... Boy, I'd hope the Higher Education Committee would have some questions to ask. I really don't think this Legislature ought to be a rubber stamp for state..."

Speaker Shea: "For what purpose does the..."

Skinner: "...that's not based on a one man-one vote basis. And with that, I will be happy to conclude my remarks before I'm interrupted."

Speaker Shea: "For what purpose does the Assistant Minority Leader arise?"

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I don't have the Calendar here but I'm told that it says that the Gentleman's motion is to discharge the Rules Committee."



Speaker Shea: "No, sir."

Walsh: "Yeah... that's not the motion?"

Speaker Shea: "No, sir. There are three motions on the Calendar with regards to this Bill."

Walsh: "All right, this is to discharge Higher Education."

Speaker Shea: "Yes, sir."

Walsh: "Fine, thank you."

Speaker Shea: "All right, the Gentleman asks leave of the House to discharge the Committee on Higher Education and place on the Calendar. Is there objection? All right, the Gentleman's motion takes 89 votes. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. 89 votes. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Take the record. On this question there are 124 'ayes', 9 'nays', 5 Members voting 'present'. Senate Bill, the motion to place Senate Bill 1651 on the Calendar on the order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day carries. Mr. Hill, what is that number? 935? On the Speaker's Table appears House Resolution 935 and on that, the Gentleman's motion is for immediate consideration of the Resolution. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, arise?"

Matijevich: "Just to make it sure to help Stone. The Calendar, the motion said First Legislative Day. I think he ought to have unanimous consent... Okay, I'm not listening tonight."

Speaker Shea: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, arise?"

Deuster: "I simply rise cause my legislative synopsis does not include this House Resolution. I presume we're going to get an explanation of what it is, substance before we're asked to act on it."

Speaker Shea: "I was about to recognize the Gentleman for that purpose."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Proceed, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have consulted with Representative Walsh on this Resolution and the Majority Leader on this side about this Resolution and the Chairman of the Executive



Committee. And they all agreed that this motion would be in proper order and the Sponsors of this Resolution is myself, Representative Schoeberlein, Representative Kempiners, and Representative Matijevich. And I would appreciate the suspension of the rule so we could consider it immediately. The Resolution calls for... it's, it's comprised because of the hard drug investigation that has taken place and you received that particular report about a week ago. And what this calls for is that the... the Dangerous Drug Commission review and adopt the actual recommendations of the Legislative Investigating Commission and to take action to bring about closer relationships between law enforcement agencies and drug treatment facilities and I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Shea: "Gentleman asks leave to use the attendance Roll Call for the adoption of the Resolution. Is there objection? Hearing none, the attendance Roll Call minus Mr. Katz' name will be used for the adoption of the Resolution. And now, Mr. Hill on House Resolution 935."

Hill: "I'd appreciate very much if we would adopt House Resolution 935."

Speaker Shea: "All those in... is there debate? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the Roll Call. On this question, there are 152 'ayes', no 'nays', no Members voting 'present'. Maragos 'aye' and the Resolution is adopted. For what purpose does the Assistant Minority Leader, Mr. Telcser, arise?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I've had a number of my Members inquire if the Revenue Committee is meeting after we adjourn."

Speaker Shea: "For once, they'd probably get some Bills out. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, D.L. Houlihan, arise?"

D.L. Houlihan: "If you would recognize me on the order of Motions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "All right, on the order of Motions appears a motion or three motions with regards to Senate Bills 1997, 2010, and 2011. Are they all of the same subject matter or do we take



them individually?"

D.L. Houlihan: "No, if you would take Senate Bill 1997 first, please."

Speaker Shea: "All right, your motion is to take it from the Calendar, to take it from... What Committee is that in, Judiciary?"

D.L. Houlihan: "Judiciary II. This has been discussed with the Chairman of the Judiciary II Committee. It has his consent. I've also discussed this in the absence of Representative Palmer who I don't see here, I discussed it with Representative Duff. It has his consent, this motion does. This is a supervision Bill and I'm asking now to have it moved to the order of Second without reference to Committee."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman asks to move Senate Bill 1997 from the Judiciary II Committee to the order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Is there objection? Hearing none... Mr. Rayson, do you object?"

Rayson: "For a question. I would like to ask a question of the Sponsor of the motion."

Speaker Shea: "Proceed."

Rayson: "What happened to the supervision that went over to the Senate Calendar?"

D.L. Houlihan: "I believe the same motion is being made over there in order to get it to Second Reading. In discussing with Representative Katz, the Chairman of the Judiciary II, if we get this to Second, we intended to amend it to put the House version into the Bill."

Rayson: "Well, as I understand it, the House Bill was passed out of the Senate and amended which pertains to the same subject. Is that right?"

D.L. Houlihan: "I don't believe it's gotten that far."

Rayson: "Well, I talked to Senator Daley tonight and he said it's done."

D.L. Houlihan: "This is Senator Daley's Bill that I have here that I'm making the motion on and he informed me just the opposite. And in speaking with Representative Katz, our intention is here to amend this Senate Bill to the House version."

Rayson: "The Amendment would come later once it's moved out, is that



what you think?"

D.L. Houlihan: "No, the Amendment would come once I get this to Second Reading."

Rayson: "Yeah, at that time. Well, I'll oppose it at that time."

Speaker Shea: "Is there objection? Hearing none, the Bill will be placed on the order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Now on... we're using the attendance Roll Call minus Mr. Katz' name. On Senate Bills 2010 and 2011, Mr. Houlihan."

D.L. Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These two Bills, Senate Bills 2010 and Senate Bill 2011 do deal with the same subject matter. I'd ask that they be considered together. I have discussed this motion with the Chairman of Banks and Savings and Loans, Representative Leon. He has agreed to it. I've discussed it also with Representative Deavers in the absence of Representative Hoffman and he has agreed to it. These Bills passed the Senate unanimously. They both provide that a customer's financial records at either a bank on the one Bill or a savings and loan, the second Bill, there is a prohibition on disclosure of those financial records unless there's an authorization by the customer or unless those records are subpoenaed. And I would ask a favorable consideration on this motion."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, am I allowed to ask a question on the merits of the particulars of the motion."

Speaker Shea: "Just on the motion, sir."

Maragos: "All right, I'll abstain."

Speaker Shea: "All right, the Gentleman asks leave to place House Bills 2010 and 2011..."

D.L. Houlihan: "Senate Bills, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "Senate Bills 2010 and Senate Bill 2011 on the order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Is there objection? Hearing none, they'll be placed on that order on the Calendar using the attendance Roll Call minus Mr. Katz' name. On the Supplemental #1 appears a motion with regards to Senate Bill 1676. And on that, the Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."



Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to have Senate Bill 1676 discharged from Judiciary I and advanced to the order of Second Reading. This has the approval of the Chairman, First Legislative Day, Second Legislative Day, right? This has the approval of Representative Washington, Chairman of Judiciary I."

Speaker Shea: "All right, the Lady asks to amend her motion to read Second Legislative Day. Now, Mr. Washington, you wish to oppose it?"

Washington: "No, I agree with it. The Judiciary Committee won't meet again and consequently, she hasn't had her day in court. May I amend the motion to include Senate Bill 1952 and that'll wipe us out completely?"

Speaker Shea: "Is there objection? Mr. Walsh, for what purpose do you arise?"

Walsh: "I wonder if the Gentleman has cleared this the minority Leader?"

Speaker Shea: "Have you talked to the Minority Leader about it, Mr. Washington?"

Washington: "No, I haven't. Mr. Walsh, I don't think there's any problem with this Bill. It deals with the panel... the review panel in medical malpractice situations. As you know, the Supreme Court ruled it unconstitutional and this was an attempt to meet the negative aspects of the right decision which made the panel unconstitutional. Passed the Senate 42 to nothing. I don't think it's controversial actually."

Speaker Shea: "Ms. Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise, ma'am?"

Geo-Karis: "If I understood Mr. Washington correctly, he talked about the medical malpractice and Senate Bill 1676 relates to..."

Speaker Shea: "No, he's asking to include with Ms. Kent's motion another Bill."

Geo-Karis: "I'm sorry, sir."

Speaker Shea: "But, why don't we, Mr. Washington, take them separately so we don't confuse things. Is there objection to Ms. Kent's motion? Hearing none, Senate Bill 1676 will be placed on the order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. That motion is adopted with the attendance Roll Call minus Mr. Katz'



name. Now, Mr. Washburn, did you seek recognition, sir?"

Washburn: "Not right now."

Speaker Shea: "All right, now on the order of Senate Bills 1952,
Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Yes, I renew my motion..."

Speaker Shea: "Sir, could I excuse you. Mr. Kucharski, could you
come to the rostrum for a minute. Go ahead, Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to amend on its face
and strike First Legislative Day and make it Second Legislative
Day."

Speaker Shea: "Is there objection? Hearing none, that will be
changed to Second."

Washington: "I addressed earlier remarks to Mr. Walsh and I was at-
tempting to explain to him that I think this Bill will be rela-
tive and noncontroversial, Mr. Walsh."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Minority Leader, Mr. Washburn."

Washburn: "I wonder if Representative Washington would hold that
motion till tomorrow?"

Speaker Shea: "Take it out of the record. Mr. Friedrich, for what
purpose do you seek recognition, sir?"

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what privilege I should
be asking for, but a few days ago the House Rules Committee voted
not to hear anymore House Bills in the House. Now, today we're
bypassing both the Senate Committees and the House Committees
to hear Senate Bills that were introduced this week. I was just
informed awhile ago they're still introducing Bills over there.
They're bypassing Committee. We're going to be expected to
bypass Committees over here when our own Members didn't get a
chance to have their own Bills heard. Now there's something
wrong about this somewhere."

Speaker Shea: "I don't think we're bypassing the Rules Committee, sir.
We'll look into their practice, sir. If they are, we certainly
should. On the order of Concurrences, Regular Calendar appears
House Bill 3858. And on that, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would move
that we nonconcur with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, and 4 to House



Bill 3858 and request that a Conference Committee be appointed.

I've cleared this with the Minority Spokesman..."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Brinkmeier, my Calendar indicates on 3858 that there's only Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3."

Brinkmeier: "That's in error. There should be four Amendments."

Speaker Shea: "Yeah, there is a fourth. All right, the Gentleman has moved to nonconcur with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, and 4. All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, and 4. Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Have we have a Supplemental Calendar #2, has been issued yet?"

Speaker Shea: "Yes, sir."

Maragos: "We have some discharge of Revenue Committee. Are they on those? I haven't seen them."

Speaker Shea: "Well, Mr. Maragos, let me place one motion before we get that."

Maragos: "Thank you, sir."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Washburn moves that the House does now stand adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning and we'll hold that until you and Mr. LaFleur work out your... what motions do we have from the Revenue Committee? You want to do them in the morning, Sam? Mr. Maragos and Mr. LaFleur have decided that they won't have a meeting tonight. They'll have it in the morning. So, Mr. Washburn renews his motion that the House stands adjourned until 10 o'clock. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the motion fails and we're still in Session. Let me take that again. All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House stands adjourned."

