Doorkeeper: "Attention Members of the House. The House will convene in fifteen minutes."

Doorkeeper: "Attention Members of the House. The House will convene in five minutes."

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

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

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. George Washington said: Labor to keep alive in your breast that little spark of celestial fire, called conscience. Let us pray. Direct us, O Lord, in all our doings, with Thy most gracious favour, and further us with Thy continual help; that in all our works begun, continued, and ended in Thee, we may glorify Thy holy name, and finally, by Thy mercy, obtain everlasting life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Messages from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurred with the House in the passage of Bills of the following titles to wit; House Bill 49, House Bill 161, passed by the Senate March 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurred with the House of Representatives passage of Bills with the following titles to wit; House Bill 220, together with an Amendment passed by the Senate as amended March 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives..."
that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles, passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Bill 33 and Senate Bill 302, passed by the Senate March 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Speaker Redmond: "Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Tipsword, Chairman from the Committee on Insurance, to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken March 29, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendation, do pass House Bill 590, do pass as amended House Bill 295. Representative Katz, Chairman from the Committee on Judiciary II, to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken March 29, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendation. Do pass House Bill 289, do pass as amended House Bill 557."

Speaker Redmond: "Introductions, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1192, Lucco. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1193, Matijevich, McClain. A Bill for an Act in relation to agreements in which property is transferred in exchange for providing extended care or care payments to the transferee. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second Day."

Reading of the Bill. House Bill 637, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code, with no Amendments. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 653, a Bill for an Act to restore access rights to property in Madison County. Second Reading of the Bill....no Committee Amendment, Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 148, Friedrich and House Joint Resolution 27, Meyer."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignments. They are all celebrating a birthday yesterday. House Bills, Second Reading. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, would you have the records show that Representative Mugalian is excused because of illness."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Hearing none the records will so show. Representative Ryan, do you have any excused absentee on the Republican side? Representative McAvoy still ill?"

Ryan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm trying to get my list but I know that Representative McAvoy is absent if there is anymore I'll let you know."

Speaker Redmond: "The record will so indicate that Representative McAvoy is excused for illness. House Bills, Second Reading. House Bill 43."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 43, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Department of Agriculture. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 65... has it been furnished? Fiscal note has not yet been furnished. 91, Representative Deuster."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 91, a Bill for an Act to authorize county boards of the several counties in Illinois to establish and operate programs of public service employment
Second Reading.... this Bill has been read a second time previously and Amendment #1 and 2, were adopted. Floor Amendment #3, Deuster, amends House Bill 91, as amended in Section 1, at the end of the last paragraph and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the adoption of Amendment #3, to House Bill 91, and I would explain what Amendment #3 does. Essentially House Bill 91, is a permissive Act which would allow our counties if they wished, in corporation with the Circuit Judges to establish public service employment programs or the Judges could assign juvenile offenders as a condition of their probation to go out and perform some useful public service work, like cleaning up litter along the roadside. The question has been raised as to whether if the counties did this and you had one of these offenders out cleaning up litter in the parks or along the roadside would he become an employee of the county or would the county, if they did this have any obligation to pay them anything. So, Amendment #3, clarifies that no person assigned to such a program shall be considered an employee for any purpose and furthermore the county board shall not be obligated to provide any compensation for the person. That is what Amendment #3 does. I think it makes it a better Bill and answers the concern that I have described. I would be happy to answer any questions and I do move the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion.... Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I have a question of the Sponsor, if he would yield?"

Deuster: "Yes, Sir."

Houlihan: "If Amendment #3 is adopted, what liability is there to the county for the negligent act of one of these persons if you state that such a person is not to be considered as
an employee?"

Deuster: "Well, there is a prior Amendment which we adopted Amendment #2, which said the county would not be responsible or liable for any notorious behavior of the person and also the county employees. If there were some supervising the person would only be liable for willful misconduct or gross negligence. I think this Amendment makes it clear that there would be no liability on the part of the county on any conceivable basis that the offender was an employee. It says for any purpose shall not be considered an employee so there would be no liability on the master servant concept as I understand it."

Houlihan: "I have another question if I may, Representative Deuster. Is there any limit as to the period of time or the maximum period of time for which such a person could be considered, you know, in this public service or is this open ended?"

Deuster: "I think like all the conditions of probation or conditional release, it would be up to the Judge depending on the nature of the offense. I think that's the safeguard, we would presume it would be reasonable and if it were not reasonable the person would appeal from the order."

Houlihan: "Do you have any provision in here for injury to such persons? Would they be covered by workmen's compensa-

Deuster: "They would not be an employee so they would not be... they would not qualify for workmen's compensation benefits."

Houlihan: "All right, I have no further questions on the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz, do you wish.... do you seek recognition?"

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I'll speak on the Bill on Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."
Anderson: "Don, in layman's language, if I was sent out to
pick up trash along the roadway and I was hit by a car
do to no fault of mine, who would be liable if anyone?"
Deuster: "Well, I'm sorry I didn't realize I was that close
to the microphone. If someone were negligent and suppose
you were a juvenile offender and the Judge had assigned
you to go out along the road or in the park to pick up
beer cans or whatever... trash. You were out there and
somebody negligently came along and hit you, you would
have a cause of action as an individual against that
negligent person.... some rules of law apply but what
the purpose of this Bill and the Amendment is to make
sure that the county is not liable for that kind of an
injury."
Anderson: "But normally I would not be there on my own picking
up this paper and if I was and someone hit me without
insurance, what would happen.... I was assigned there?"
Deuster: "Well, unless there was a statute, Representative
Anderson, nobody is responsible for someone else's negligence.
If you happen to be out... suppose as a condition of
which is attached to your court.... if you're attending a drunk driving school
or you know, there is a long list of things that judges
can assign somebody to. They can assign them to.... come
home at 9:00 at night and if you're home at 10:00 at
night and somebody injures you, it's got nothing to
do with the Judge or the program. You can sue the person
who negligently or willfully hurt you. Does that answer
your question?"
Anderson: "I guess not entirely because if I'm assigned to
pick up papers and some supervisor is over me and I get
hit, I really wouldn't normally be out there picking up
the paper... and the Judge...."
Deuster: "That's true and that is the reason for the prior
Amendment which has been adopted, which says that if the
county... if they choose to undertake such a program and the
purpose of the Bill is to make it more attractive for them to do that; the Amendment says the county is not going to be liable."

Anderson: "Thank you."

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

Deuster: "This is a simple Amendment which just says that a person who is out there is not considered an employee for any purpose and the county has no obligation to pay them. I think it improves the Bill and I urge the adoption of Amendment #3, to House Bill 91."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand that a fiscal note has not been furnished yet, so we'll have to hold this on Second Reading. How about 92, Representative Deuster?"

Deuster: "On House Bill 92, there is an identical Amendment which is numbered #4. I would move the adoption of Amendment #4, which has to do with the same thing that House Bill 92. To provide that in three places in the Bill. It provides no minor assigned to public service employment shall be considered an employee for any purpose or shall the county board be obligated to provide compensation to the minor."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 92, has been read a second time previously, Committee...... floor Amendment #4, Deuster, amends House Bill 92 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion on the Amendment? The Gentleman... the question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #4, those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Madigan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, if I could have the attention of the Members, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I understand that the motion which I shall propose is agreed to by the Republican Leadership. And I propose that the posting requirements be suspended to allow the normal Tuesday Committees, which will meet on Friday of this week, to post Bills for hearing on Friday, which would be in violation of the six and a half day notice requirements. So, Mr. Speaker, at this time I would move to suspend the appropriate rule to allow those Committees to post Bills to be heard on Friday of this week."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there discussion?"

Madigan: "And Mr. Speaker, that posting must be completed before noon today. Would you emphasize that to the Chairmen, Mr. Speaker? The posting must be completed before noon today to be heard on Friday."

Speaker Redmond: "Question... any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the suspension of the rule. Are there any objections? Use the Attendance Roll Call in favor of the Gentleman's motion. The rule is suspended. Representative Hart, 106, do you want that one called? 117, Representative Satterthwaite."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 117, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 155."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 155, a Bill for an Act to define Illinois residents for the purpose of determining tuition..."
at state supported colleges and universities. Second
Reading of the Bill, Committee Amendment #1, has been
adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further Amendments? Any motion with re-
spect to Amendment #1, by any Members? Are there any
floor Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Lucco. Amends House Bill
155, as amended by deleting everything after the enacting
clause and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amend-
ment #2, is inserted because we feel that the state
supported colleges and universities are under the jurisdic-
tion of one of the four governing boards...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "An inquiry of the Clerk, Mr. Speaker? Has this
Amendment been printed and distributed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Has not yet been distributed...."

Lucco: "Yes, it has, Sir. It has been distributed. It has been
distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand that it has been distributed.
Proceed, Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "He has a copy, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Be quiet."

Lucco: "To summarize it, the universities and colleges are
under the jurisdiction of one of the four governing
boards established by law. The Board of Trustees of
the University of Illinois, the Board of Regents which
includes the Illinois State University at Northern and
Sangamon State University, the Board of Trustees of
Southern Illinois University and the Board of Governors
of the state colleges and universities which manages
Eastern Illinois, Northern University, Western and
Chicago State University and Northeastern Illinois
University and the Governor’s State University. Whereas,
these boards are charged with operating, managing and controlling and maintaining universities under their offices with specific reference to tuition. It should also be a function of these boards to establish residency. Now, throughout the State of Illinois there is a variance among some universities; some have three months established residence, some have six months in order to establish residency and my point in this Amendment is to give the authority for the Board of Governors of the various colleges and universities and permit them to establish whatever length of residency is necessary. I solicit your support for Amendment #2.

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steele."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a very important matter which certainly I would oppose very strongly as a bad Amendment which completely scuttles the intent and the purpose of this good Bill. What this Amendment would do is virtually open up the doors of the Illinois Institutions to practically all out-of-state students from Indiana, Missouri, Wisconsin and wherever else, to require in-state tuition privileges to be treated with the same kind preferential treatment as our Illinois students are entitled to be treated here in the State of Illinois. And, I would point out to you, that we are raising the tuition cost of Illinois students. There is a shortage of tuition income and we need to at least establish minimum requirements for out of state students. And the Bill as it stands without this bad Amendment would require that out of state students have at least a twelve month residency before they are given the same preferential treatment as our own Illinois students. We are short on educational dollars. We certainly cannot afford to educate all the students of all the surrounding states. I would point out to you that as our Illinois students go to Missouri as they go..."
to Indiana, Wisconsin, they have very rigid guidelines they must qualify for. They must pay the out of state tuition, they must pay the out of state tuition for maybe all four years. And here in Illinois all we're trying to establish is a minimum of twelve months. Now, the Bill as it stands gives the Governing Board the final authority in this matter which they should have, but it sets a minimum standard and prevents us from trying to educate students from all out of states that surround us and giving them the same preferential treat-ment as our own Illinois students. I think it is a bad Amendment. I think it scudles the very intent and purpose of this Bill. I think it should be opposed and voted down."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank...."

Speaker Redmond: "I have been advised there are unauthorized persons on the floor. All unauthorized persons leave the chambers, please. Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of Amendment #2. I would like to point out at the onset of my discussion that this Bill did get out of the House Higher Education Committee with a bare minimum votes that was necessary to do so. I think this Amendment makes a bad Bill somewhat better. There is a lot of discussion as to the true intent of House Bill 155, without this Amendment. If you read the Bill it does not decipher specifically whether that twelve month is the suggestion or for the purposes of this Act, in that the board can make requirements other than that twelve month. The other interpretation would be that the twelve month is a minimum and that the board can levy more than a twelve month requirement. Amendment #2 to House Bill 155 clarifies that very distinctly and it gives the Governing Board the right to
determine what the residency requirements for that particular university or universities under their jurisdiction would be. I think that Amendment #2, clarifies it good...clarifies it well, excuse me, and that it would be a good addition to House Bill 155 and I ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When this Bill came to the Higher Education Committee it was the subject of considerable discussion, but it was voted out of the Committee, I think probably based on the attitude that we are short of funds for all education in the state. We are short of funds particularly in Higher Education and if we are to believe the Governing Board, then we need to increase tuition. If we increase tuition on Illinois students going to the institution of Higher Education in this state then certainly I think it is reasonable and proper to expect that students who come over our borders to attend our institutions should carry their fair share of the load. Actually what we're talking about here is in the neighborhood of one and a half million dollars. In the tuition increase proposals of the various Governing Boards we're talking about a nine million dollar increase. It seems to me that if we can pick up one and a half million from the out of state students and I see absolutely no comparable nor provable reason why we cannot, then we certainly should do so. I can understand that a certain Governing Board is trying to protect its student numbers so that when it comes to appropriations that it won't have to try to justify the same budget that it presently has with a reduced number of students. But, I submit, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that the number of students will not decrease to any appreciable extent and this is a reasonable and proper approach to take to the question of tuition for out of state students."
This Amendment certainly... almost irreparably damages Representative Steele's Bill and would certainly subvert the issue of the Bill and would be in essence, offering a free ride to out of state students. I strongly oppose this Amendment and would hope that you would vote 'no' on the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative D.L. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I have a question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker, if he will yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Houlihan: "Representative Lucco, am I correct in assuming that there is a lower tuition rate on Illinois residents than for a non-Illinois resident in a state supported college or university?"

Lucco: "That's correct."

Houlihan: "Now, under the Amendment here.... does it.... could you tell me what the present state of the law is as far as definition of residency?"

Lucco: "The present law is really not very clear. It says in fact, that... it refers to minors and the law was passed back in 1963 and at that time minors were at the age.... that is, anyone under the age of twenty-one, today as you know it is under eighteen. It has left it up to the Board Governors in essence and this particular Bill would make unanimity throughout the state. I agree with that. However, I think that it still... it should be the prerogative of the Governing Board of the various colleges and universities to accept this... Now then, certain universities that are adjacent to nearby states such as Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky and Wisconsin, have reciprocal agreements with schools in those states. And this Bill would aggregate those reciprocal agreements and as a result, particularly in our area, the Southern Illinois University, would lose possibly, potentially up to one thousand students which would be a loss of a lot of income to the state
universities."

Houlihan: "Well, Representative Lucco, further question; pursuant to this Amendment, the Governing Board could not set a residence requirement to exceed twelve months, is that correct?"

Lucco: "That's correct and our Amendment also says not to exceed twelve months. There is a variation of residency time, University of Illinois, I believe it is six months and Southern Illinois University is three months and it varies from school to school. And I think that's what we're trying to do in this Amendment; to permit each Governing Board to establish their own residency time."

Houlihan: "Would I be correct also, in assuming that if I read your Amendment correctly, that a student could actually be a non-resident, be eligible only if his parents were residents of the state simply at the beginning of the term?"

Lucco: "That is correct, Sir."

Houlihan: "Is that currently presently the provision under any state college or university? Has that Governing Board gone that far... as far as determining residency simply if the parents of the students were at the beginning of the school term residents of the state?"

Lucco: "No, the student if they are emancipated, emancipated minors are not residents... living with their parents of course can establish residence dependent upon the time as fixed by the Governing Board of that particular college."

Houlihan: "I have no further questions."

Lucco: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise in support of Representative Lucco's Amendment #2, to House Bill 155. He has clearly outlined the fact that some universities have problems with the twelve month residency requirement."
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and indeed I think makes some compelling arguments both here and on the floor that his own particular university would be harmed by 155, without this Amendment. I think that it is important that the board be able to set up their own residency requirements, Representative Lucco's Amendment allows for that. It would give them the necessary flexibility from board to board and school to school to determine what should be a fair residency requirement and to protect the interest of the state and the taxpayers. I don't think that a twelve month requirement is good for all schools. It may be for some but not for all and this ought to be a matter within the purview of each University Governing Board. And I strongly urge you to support Representative Lucco's Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Amendment. If ever there was a Bill that is in the best interest of the taxpayers, it is House Bill 155. Now, it simply doesn't make sense to educate the students from Missouri and Kentucky and Iowa and Indiana at the same cost that we're charging Illinois students. We all know that the tuition rates amounts to about one-third of the actual cost of educating an Illinois student. And I see no reason why students from other states can come over here and within thirty days actually sign up as a in-state student and receive the benefits of Illinois students. On the same... on the other hand, any area... boarder area that want to take the same advantage from other state, they are not available. If you go to Missouri, you have to be in that school for twelve months before you're determined as a resident. And I see no reason why the taxpayers of Illinois should finance the higher education of out of state students. I think that it's right that they pay out of state tuition fees. Thank you."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must rise and oppose this Amendment because I think what we're doing here, we're getting away from what the real thrust of the Bill legislation is all about. I think the legislation is a real fine piece of legislation, something that the taxpayers need in this state. And therefore, I think with an Amendment on it, it would really put the Bill where it wouldn't be a satisfactory Bill at all. And therefore, I must oppose it."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Lucco to close. Pardon me, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I would agree with Representative Stiehl that this is certainly a miserable Amendment. Our state universities have continually complained that they don't have enough money. They raise tuition for instate students only under desist. Now it appears they don't even want to charge the out of state students. Well, I had to pay higher tuition when I went to the University of Michigan, as an Illinois resident and I don't see any reason that Missouri students shouldn't have to do the same. And suggesting that a minimum of twelve months out of state tuition is too much, it is just absurd. I would really wonder if the University... if the Southern Illinois University has any out of state tuition money coming in to it. I wouldn't be surprised to find out that everybody's home mailing address is for grades are paying... that everybody is paying no out of state tuition whatsoever. And if S.I.U. is that desperate to fill up its classrooms, perhaps we ought to close one of the campuses, maybe the one with the fewer number of students."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will. Representative Lucco...."
Ebbesen: "Representative Lucco."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco... will Representative Geo-Karis stop distracting Representative Lucco. Representative Ebbesen."
Ebbesen: "Representative Lucco, could you tell me, I'm sure that... and I don't blame you for this, that one of the institutions that you're certainly representing and trying to protect in view this... geographic location is Southern Illinois University and my question to you is. Roughly how many students do you have that come from out of state?"
Lucco: "Yes, thank you. At Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville is close to one thousand students that are now residing in Edwardsville area who are from the State of Missouri. Seven hundred and fifty has been the lowest number that we have had and it varies between seven fifty and one thousand And these people have established residence according to the Board of Governor's stipulation of three months, And they are working there and many of them of course have graduated and remained in our area."
Ebbesen: "Is it a fair assumption to say that out of state... for those who pay an out of state tuition at Southern Illinois University in fact of all institutions of higher learning, it's roughly about double what the in-state student pays?"
Lucco: "I would think that is a correct assumption."
Ebbesen: "Well, would it be a fair assumption then to say that you could lose up to, if you have a thousand students, you could lose up to 50% of them and still as far as the dollar exchange it's a wash and..."
Lucco: "But..."
Ebbesen: "All right, go ahead."
Lucco: "Pardon me. If you lose a thousand students you don't decrease the cost of operations or education And so as a result the cost for pupil would be going up. So I don't
believe that you can measure just in the amount of dollars and cents that you might make or lose."

Ebbeisen: "Well, that's my point. I think that this is the thrust of the entire piece of legislation is that some uninformative and we're talking about Illinois dollars vs. other than Illinois dollars. And to me, I think your Amendment would completely destroy the intention of this legislation. I certainly would encourage everyone to give careful scrutiny to what we're doing here on this Amendment and ruin what I think is probably one of the best pieces of legislation that this House has passed in this Session. In the interest of the Illinois taxpayers and these institutions of higher learning, I would certainly encourage everyone to cast a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco to close."

Lucco: "I like the word unanimity very very much, but I also like the word or the terms, local control. And in this Amendment we are in a sense providing local control because the university in the northern part of the State of Illinois and the southern part and the central part of the State of Illinois have entirely different problems. We recognize this by the fact that all of the colleges and universities are not under one Governing Board. We do have four Governing Boards and we the Legislature have mandated these four Governing Boards to so govern these universities with...underneath their jurisdiction. And I believe that if we give them the right to fix the tuition of their schools interdependant of the tuition that might be fixed at other schools throughout the state, then we also ought to give them the right to establish residency to the best advantage of that particular local institution or institution underneath that one particular Governing Board."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment §2. Those in favor vote..."
'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Steele."

Steele: "Yes, in certainly explaining my vote and urging your 'no' to this bad Amendment, what it would actually do is open up the doors of our institutions to out of state students to come in here and in some institutions perhaps with only a drivers license. obtain the same preferential treatment that are Illinois students and I think that is a bad policy, this is a good Bill. It does retain the authority and the Board of Governors that establishes the minimum requirement comparable with other states. We can no longer be the Santa Clause of the midwest and I urge more red lights on this bad Amendment, would scuttle a good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 38 'aye' and 91 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Oh, pardon me. A fiscal note has been requested on this. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, now that Amendment 92 has failed or has not been adopted, I should like leave to withdraw my request for a fiscal note."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman have leave? Third Reading. 216, out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. 232, Representative Sevcik. 232."


Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 259... 251."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 251, a Bill for an Act to create the death penalty and establish procedures therefore, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment §1, Deuster. Amends House Bill 251, on page 1, line 1, by deleting 'and' and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House: I rise with some humility. Now and then I come up with a good idea that is excepted by the House. In the case of the Death Penalty Bill, House Bill 251, as it was written. I had this unusual provision that a defendant who was convicted could at his option, defer the date of his execution... five years. That idea was offered as an Amendment to Representative Kosinski's excellent Bill and it was rejected by the House. Therefore, I do not intend to pursue that concept any further and I would move to table Amendment §1, to House Bill 251. It is my own Amendment, to my own Bill and I move to table that Amendment... or I ask leave to table it."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing no objection, table Amendment §1, is tabled."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor, Amendment §2, Cunningham. Amends House Bill 251, on page 11, by adding after line 30, the following: (J) and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have been a little uncertain about this Bill. I don't know how far the Sponsor is going with it and those doubts have not been resolved by his comments here this morning. But, just as pep would out point, is piffle to have a death penalty on the statute without execution is a meaningless futility. I do not wish to be caught gasly or grisly but it is time for the Members of the Legislature to recognize that we waist an awful lot of time on this floor talking about death penalties unless there are executions. I believe that public safety can only be protected by executions and I believe that we
need to face that reality loudly and clearly. I have
great personal doubt of whether society itself has the
moral resolved to carry the death penalty to that pre-
scribed goal, but it is time for us to shift the money
from the back of the Legislature on to the backs of the
Judiciary. The money that I'm talking about is this
never ending circle of argument whether or not the death
penalty is a deterrent. That question can never be answered
unless there is some application of the penalty that is
prescribed. It is a historic fact that for many years
prior to the final coup de grace by the Supreme Court
that there were no executions because the Judiciary did
not have that resolved... did not have that determination,
did not have that will to protect the public by the
statutes prescribe remedy: What we seek by this Bill
is to say to the judiciary and say to the public, if the
penalty is not inflicted for the prescribed period of
five years, then the statute is terminated and has no
longer any force of effect. I say to you, that if you're
serious in adopting the death penalty, you should be
serious in prescribing in the statute that reasonable
precaution... then the public would make known its
will through its servants on the bench and those who
are responsible for carrying out the laws that we enact.
So the purpose is very clear to shift to others where
the responsibility belongs, the responsibility of carrying
out the law that we enact. I ask you to adopt the
Amendment that says, that if there are no executions
for five years from the date that the law is enacted then
the statute becomes terminated, null and void, no longer in effect.
I would appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is on
the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Amendment
§2. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'.... those
in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative
Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the prior speaker has uttered a lot of sound and fury, signifying nothing in this case although everything he said was correct. I've indicated to him that it was my intention to abandon the substances of this Bill which was the five year deferral. And so his Amendment, although it made sense originally, does not make any sense now. And his Amendment in a way was designed to make folly of my original notion and I respect that and appreciate that and thank him for his eloquence and thank you for the 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham. You better hurry up before Representative Skinner finds out you're........"

Cunningham: "I want at this time to move to withdraw the particular Amendment. There is no point in butting one's head against the wall to feel better when you quit. The idea is right but the timing isn't and we ask leave to withdraw the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to withdraw Amendment #2? Hearing no objection, Amendment #2, is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Madison. Amends House Bill 251, on page 1, by deleting line 1 and 2 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #4, is the Infamous Madison Amendment to require that where the death penalty has been imposed, that the execution must be witnessed by six Members of the General Assembly. Given the response, Mr. Speaker, of that Amendment to the previous Death Penalty Bill, I will bow to reality and respectfully request that this Amendment be tabled."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to table Amendment #3. Hearing no objection, Amendment #3 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"
Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Deuster. Amends House Bill 251, on page 1, by deleting line 1 and 2, so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is now on Second Reading and Amendment #4 converts the Bill and I would like to describe what is done with the adoption of this Amendment. The Bill which I hope we would consider and vote up or down on Third Reading, would strike everything after enacting clause and simply provide as follows; as you know under present Illinois law the death penalty is implemented by electrifying or frying the defendant. This Amendment simply provides that instead of electrocution, the death would be inflicted by the injection of a lethal chemical that would produce death. I would urge the adoption of Amendment #4. It will put the Bill into the form that we can debate it at some long length.... the House is interested on Third Reading and consider whether we ought to make progress forward or make a change in the method by which we put killers to death. That's what it does, it strikes 'electrocution of the defendant' and provides instead 'the injection of a lethal chemical.' I urge the adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "A question of the Sponsor, if he will yield? Representative Deuster, what does this mean, does this mean the gas chamber?"

Deuster: "In answer to your question, no it does not. The precise language of the Amendment is, the law would wind up reading: 'A sentence of death shall be executed and punishment of death inflicted by the administration of a continuous intravenous injection.' That means a needle into the arm, I would presume, of a lethal quantity of an ultra fast acting barbiturate in combination with a chemical paralytic agent. So, it would not be the gas..."
chamber, it would be an injection in the arm and although I don't like to make the analogy, it would be the same way that the Humane Society put to death the animals that need to be killed."

Houlihan: "Is this method of capital punishment in use any in the United States or in any other state other than Illinois?"

Deuster: "It is not in use although a number of Legislatures are considering it. It has been passed by the Oklahoma Senate and a number of other Bills, Texas, I guess has Legislation pending. Maryland has Legislation pending but it is not in use. Directly to answer your question in other states however, I felt the Illinois House ought to consider the idea and that's why I offer the Amendment and hope that it will be adopted and hope that on Third Reading then, we can decide whether that's the change that we would like to innovate on the part of our state."

Houlihan: "What is expected... how long does death take to ensue here with this type of method of capital punishment?"

Deuster: "I'm sorry, I did not hear your question. It was how long something."

Houlihan: "How long does it take, this method of capital punishment for death to ensue... how quick?"

Deuster: "Oh, very quickly... a matter of minutes or hours."

Houlihan: "Or hours, that's what I want to get at. Is it hours or is it minutes or is it seconds?"

Deuster: "I think it is a matter of minutes... you know, have you ever seen this done?"

Houlihan: "No, I haven't that's why I'm asking these questions. I'm totally unfamiliar with this method of capital punishment that you are proposing here in the Amendment."

Deuster: "It's normally a matter of seconds."

Houlihan: "Has it ever been used... has it ever been provided for in any state?"

Deuster: "No, Sir."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."
Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker... can you hear me?"
Speaker Redmond: "I don't know whether anybody else can but I can. Please give the Gentleman order."
Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I've been very carefully on top of the action in Oklahoma, New Mexico and had a great deal of correspondence relative to this subject. The Amendment or the method of execution may... I repeat, may have merit. The consideration nationally now is whether this system will kill the deterrent relative to capital punishment. I would strongly recommend to this House that we do not clutter up death penalty legislation with this secondary consideration at this time. If it proves meaningful and if it proves to be effective, there should be a special consideration after.... I repeat, after the State of Illinois has a Capital Punishment Law. I don't think at this time it helps the Sponsor even though it is his Amendment. I think this merely clutters up the Bill excessively. It makes for several considerations because a great number of people in Oklahoma, on a twenty-three to twenty-one vote in the Senate, felt that it would kill deterrent affect of capital punishment. I would strongly recommend to the Sponsor of this said General Assembly, that we keep the purity of House Bill 251 and do not apply this Amendment at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."
Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just once gain express my opposition to all forms of capital punishment and I'm going to tell you why. Capital punishment is for poor people who are without capital. I repeat, it is for people who are without capital. It's named right all right because if you have some capital, you won't die by the electric chair, you won't die by shooting, you won't die by hanging. There are enough slick, smart lawyers in this country to keep you..."
alive the rest of your life. It's for people without
capital and I'm opposed to all forms of it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster to close."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of Representative
Kosinski, who is a Legislator that I admire very much
and his interest in keeping the purity of my Bill as it
was introduced originally. However, I have become con-
vinced that the Bill in its original form of something
that the House was not interested in. There is no point
in sending two substantive Bills over with respect to
the death penalty. His excellent Bill has gone over.
I would hope that this Amendment would be adopted and
then on Third Reading if the Members have views one
way or another as to whether injection instead of elec-
trocution would lessen the deterrent effect or be some-
thing that we would not want to do, that we could take
care of it at that time. I urge the adoption of Amend
#4, which is my Amendment to my own Bill and I thank
you for your 'yes' vote on Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion
for the adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor vote
'ayes', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished?
Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?
The Clerk will take the record. On this question there
are 20 'aye' and 73 'no', the Gentleman's motion fails.
Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Anderson,
do you... Representative Anderson, do you have a visitor
there that used to be here? Isn't that Representative
Hunsicker? Why don't you tell the world? Representative
Anderson... I wanted Representative Anderson to introduce
a former Representative Hunsicker, but Representative
Anderson is too sick."

Hunsicker: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. It is certainly a privilege and a pleasure to be back on the floor to see what's going on down here in Springfield. I miss all of my friends a lot and sometimes I wish I was down here to grab one of these microphones and spout off a little like I used to when I was a Member of the House. At any rate, it is real nice to be here and thanks a lot for the recognition."

Speaker Redmond: "261."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 261, a Bill for an Act to allow officers and employees of the State of Illinois to purchase flags from the state at cost from the Secretary of State. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1, was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any Members who has motion with respect to Amendment #1? Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Has the fiscal note been furnished? We'll have to hold it on Third Reading... Second Reading rather. 281."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 281, a Bill for an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Fiscal note has not yet been furnished. 308."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 308, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the performance of medical, dental or surgical procedures on and counseling for minors. Second Reading of the Bill. Committee Amendment #1 and 2, were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski. Are there any motions with respect to Amendment #1? Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I have talked... Mr. Speaker, with the Sponsor of the Bill. I have a motion to table an Amendment here, perhaps we could take it out of the record and we could hold it... at this time."
Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 318."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 318, a Bill for an Act to amend
the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill, Committee
Amendment #1, was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any motion... does any Member have
any motion in respect to Amendment #1? Are there any
floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Johnson. Amends House Bill
318 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson. Representative Dyer,
your Bill is up and there is a floor Amendment. Are
you aware of it?"

Dyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
Amendment #2, to House Bill 318, basically deletes the
language requiring that the member... voting member of
I.S.S.C. be chosen from groups... multi-campus groups,
some of which are enumerated in the statute. All this
Amendment does is to provide that the appointment shall
be made by the Governor. I believe this Amendment has
the support of all the student groups involved plus
the Sponsor and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As
Sponsor of 318, I support this Amendment. It does have
the support of all the people involved. I think it makes
a good Bill even better so I do move for the passage of
Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is
on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment
#2. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes'
have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further
Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 348... I understand there is an Amendment been filed that is not yet been printed, Representative O'Brien, so we'll take this out of the record. 374."

Clerk O'Brien: "He wants to know if we'll come back to it."

Speaker Redmond: "If it gets here, we will. Who filed the Amendment, Representative O'Brien? I mean... Representative... yeah, Clerk O'Brien instead of Representative O'Brien. Who filed the Amendment? Are you, Representative O'Brien, are you aware of the Amendment?"

O'Brien: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Who is the Sponsor of it?"

O'Brien: "Representative Walsh, is the Sponsor of the Amendment. I am aware of it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is an Amendment that... did you want to hold this or can we proceed?"

Speaker Redmond: "I understand that we don't have it printed and distributed, is that correct, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, the Bill... the Amendment is not printed yet."...

Speaker Redmond: "So, we can't proceed with the Amendment."

Walsh: "Maybe we can get back to it."

O'Brien: "Can we get back to it?"

Speaker Redmond: "We will if we can. I can't promise that it will be printed, is the big problem when it comes....."

O'Brien: "I'll get it printed for you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "374."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 374, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 380."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 380..."
Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Bradley on the floor? Take it out of the record. 392."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 392, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the River Conservancy Districts Act. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment would provide that when there is a sale of land that the publication for that sale would be in the county where the land is situated or if it is in more than one county, that it would be published in all of the counties. And it also provides that in the event of the sale, that any of the people from whom the land was obtained are still alive... if they make a bid equal to the high bid, that it would be struck off to them. And, I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

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

"The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor... Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will." Representative Hart."

Schlickman: "Why do you restrict the option of a landowner to purchase an amount equal to the highest bid to a natural person? Couldn't you have a corporation owning land that was subject to acquisition and shouldn't it have the opportunity of first refusal?"

Hart: "It would be all right if they did... but we just... probably didn't consider that ever occurred. I can't remember of it ever occurring in our area so that's the reason."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment say 'aye',
opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 407."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 407, a Bill for an Act to require the payment of interest by lessors for residential real property on security deposits made by lessees. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment.... Committee Amendment #1, was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Member with a motion with respect to Amendment #1? Are there any floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 408."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 408, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Jackson-Union Counties Regional Port District. Second Reading of the Bill, Committee Amendment #1, was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Member have any motion with respect to Amendment #1? Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 421."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 421, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning land titles. Second Reading of the Bill, Committee Amendment #1, was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Does any Member have a motion with respect to Amendment #1? Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "I move the adoption of Amendment #1. What it does, it changes the word from 'order' to 'finding' and provides for judicial review. I move the adoption of Committee Amendment #1, to House Bill 421."

Speaker Redmond: "This is already adopted, Representative Yourell. This is under the new rule so you don't have to move the adoption. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No floor Amendments."
Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 451."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 451, a Bill for an Act relating to and authorizing the formation of close corporations. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 485."


Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 536."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 536, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the..... does any Member have a motion with respect to Amendment #1? No, Member indicates that he has a motion. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No floor Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 537."


Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 538."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 538, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to recorders. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Member have a motion with respect to Amendments #1 or 2? Hearing none, are there any floor Amendments?"
Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 571, has the fiscal note been furnished?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, it has not been furnished."

Speaker Redmond: "Has not been furnished. 591,... have been advised the Amendment has been filed but it has not been printed, we'll take that out of the record. 601, has the fiscal note been furnished on 601?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, it has not been furnished."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 602."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 602, a Bill for an Act to amend Section of the Illinois Local Library Act. Second Reading of the Bill, Committee Amendment #1, was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Member have a motion with respect to Amendment #1? Hearing none... any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 603."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 603, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Local Library Act. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1, was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Member have a motion with respect to Amendment #1? Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There is a series of Bills 601, 02, 03 and 04, that Amendments were discussed in Committee to be offered on Second Reading. So I would hope that you would hold these Bills on Second until that time... I believe that...."

Speaker Redmond: "1 and 2, have been... well there is no Amendment on 1, am I correct on that?"

Yourell: "Tom, what is your pleasure on 601 and 602?"

Speaker Redmond: "602, we have already adopted Amendment #1 and it is on Third Reading now, is that correct?"

Yourell: "Representative McMaster's."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, we did discuss some Amendments and possibly further Amendments other than the ones that were presented in Committee. We have no opposition to the Committee Amendments but I don't have my material over here with me today and we don't know... I'm not sure just which Bills we were going to amend from the number of them and I would like to have them held and I know that Representative Yourell, is in agreement...."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

McMaster: "That we will either hold them or if necessary move them back from Third to Second for the Amendments when we do have them ready, which will probably be hopefully this week."

Speaker Redmond: "602, is on Third Reading with the understanding it will be returned if necessary."

McMaster: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll leave 603, held on Second Reading 604, held on Second Reading, is that correct?"

McMaster: "Right."

Speaker Redmond: "618."

Clérk O'Brien: "House Bill 618, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to public water districts. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clérk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 348."

Clérk O'Brien: "House Bill 348, a Bill for an Act in relation to uniformity of sales at retail of consumer necessities. Second Reading of the Bill, Committee Amendment #1, was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further Amendments? Any Member have a motion with respect to Amendment #1, to House Bill 348? Hearing none... any further Amendments?"

Clérk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Walsh. Amends House Bill
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2, makes absolutely clear that a retail establishment is not required under this Bill to sell alcoholic liquor all of the hours that they are open. This has the concurrence of and was indeed made up by the Sponsor of the Bill, Representative O'Brien and I move the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien:" Representative Schneider, are you on the phone? Representative O'Brien.

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Representative Walsh is correct, this is a Republican Amendment. There was some question as to whether or not alcoholic liquor would be included within the scope of the Bill and this takes it out... it is a one sentence Amendment and I support it and urge the Members to vote in favor of it."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #2, those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Polk, do you desire 261? Out of the Record. 281, that was. Any other House Bill on Second Reading? Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to have leave to have Representative Walsh and Representative Catania and Representative Schlickman, shown as Cosponsors of the Bill. They had similar Bills in Committee and they have been working on this measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection it will show as Sponsors, Walsh, Schlickman and
Catania. 624. Representative Byers, 624. Has that fiscal note been furnished on that?

Byers: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "Hold that one. 625, Byers. 627... 632."


Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O’Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 679, Representative Dyer."

Clerk O’Brien: "House Bill 679, a Bill for an Act to clarify the powers and duties of the nonvoting student members of various boards of institutions of higher education. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1, has been adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Does any Member... that doesn’t show on your Calendar that way. Please make a notation that 679, has Amendment #1, adopted in Committee. Any Member: have a motion with respect to Amendment #1? Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O’Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. House Bills. Third Reading. House Bill, Third Reading appears House Bill 14, Representative Yourell... out of the record. 212, Representative Totten, do you desire to make a motion with respect to 212?"

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like leave of the House to move House Bill 212, back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, 212 will be returned to the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O’Brien: "Amendment #3, amends House Bill 212, on page 2, by deleting line 20 through 24. That is Representative
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment, Amendment 83, to House Bill 212 has the assent I believe of the Sponsor and it eliminates those four lines 20 through 24, which according to the proponent of this concept as well as the people at the Department of Public Aid, add unnecessary verbiage to the statute and can add some potential obstacle to prosecution under House Bill 212 and I would move its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "D.L. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Could you read how the Bill would then... the form that the Bill would be in if the Amendment is adopted? I'm not quite following what you're doing here, deleting four lines."

Johnson: "The Bill would basically be as it is now except for line 20 through 24."

Houlihan: "Which means that it would read as follows, if I'm following your Amendment correctly. If guilty of a Class 4 felony, or the case of so obtaining public aid in the amount not exceeding one hundred and fifty dollars in value is, and then the next word is 'statement' or 'representation' during on his eligibility. It seems to be a dramatical gap here and that is why I'm wondering how this will read."

Johnson: "I don't have the Bill in front of me, Representative Houlihan. I'm willing to hold this Amendment until I have had a chance to look at it, to clarify that."

Houlihan: "I see, do you want to take it out of the records?"

Johnson: "Yeah, that's fine."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. It will remain on Second Reading. House Bill 509, on Third Reading. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would ask leave to return House Bill 509 to the Order of Second
Reading for the purpose of adoption of Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, it will be returned to the Order of Second Reading, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, amends House Bill 509 on page 4, by inserting after line 13, the following: (d) and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 509, provides for a procedure by which a territory can disconnect from a township library and annex to a library district following a referendum. Amendment #1 to 509 simply provides that if there is such a disconnection, the people living in the disconnected area will still be responsible for their pro rata share of the bonded indebtedness of the township library from which they have disconnected by referendum. This is a responsibility that does exist in the statute with respect to similar types of disconnections and on that basis I move that Amendment #1 to House Bill 509, be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1. Representative Conti."

Conti: "Will the Speaker yield to a..... if a, say a large municipality of twenty thousand wants to annex this library and the area that they are going to disconnect from is an unincorporated area with a population of may be five or six hundred, who votes on this, The people in the community themselves or just those are in the unincorporated area?"

Schlickman: "Well, that issue is in the Bill; it is not in the Amendment, but, anticipating consideration of the Bill the residents of both parts would vote on the measure."

Conti: "What chance would the people in the unincorporated area have; a five hundred population against this municipality
of twenty or twenty-five thousand?"

Schlickman: "Well, again going to the merits of the Bill rather than the Amendment, the point there being that the library district that would like to annex certainly ought to have the opportunity to vote on the matter. And the people who are to disconnect from the township library and annex to the library district certainly ought to have an opportunity to vote on the matter."

Conti: "What I have in mind is, I'm right next door to Chicago, if Chicago decides to come over and take our library board over, what chance will be have with thirty thousand population in Elmwood Park against three and a half million people in the City of Chicago in their referendum?"

Schlickman: "Well, first of all the petition for disconnection and annexation has to come from within the area outside the city."

Conti: "You explained it, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The motion carries and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 212... D.L. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, on Amendment #3, Representative Johnson's Amendment. I misread the Amendment, I have no objections to the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question... Representative Johnson's motion to adopt Amendment #3, those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 591, Representative Lucco. Representative Stuffle, is there an Amendment? Is there an Amendment on 591, do we have the Amendment here?"
Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, has the Committee Amendment been adopted?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 591, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of School Code. Amendment #1, was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any Member that has a motion with respect to Amendment #1? Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Stuffle, amends House Bill 591, on page 2, line 16 and so forth."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, Amendment #2, is in response to some questions raised in the Senate to a similar Bill to Representative Lucco's. Representative Lucco is in complete agreement with the Amendment. It merely clarifies that we're talking about classrooms for special education students, classroom facilities and it also provides that where a number of districts are involved in the cooperative special education program, that to allow classroom facilities for special education students who now house, to be utilized for different purposes for cost efficiency and so on, that each of those school districts is now in agreement and simply the districts involved in that cooperative would have to approve of such usage. I would ask for the adoption of Amendment #2."

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

Waddell: "Would the sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates that he will."

Waddell: "Under the provisions that were made originally for special education.... does this in any way then say to a school that instead of having those funds for that particular facility, that now they can be used for anything that they want to use it for?"

Stuffle: "The Amendment and the Bill states that since the facilities have already been built, the tax has already been approved.... if in the opinion of the school district..."
with the approval of both the service region and the state superintendent, that there is a better use for the facilities in terms of the ability to save cost while still providing special education services, they can be used for other school purposes. They couldn't be used without that approval and they couldn't be used unless there could be showing that they could be cost efficient. We're not taking any students out of classrooms, we're merely trying to utilize facilities in the best manner and cost efficient manner."

Waddell: "How about the future then of those facilities as prescribed by the law in where they want to set up facilities specifically for special education? How about the future of it?"

Stuffle: "There would be nothing to prevent the reuse of the facilities that have been converted, if that is what you're asking."

Waddell: "No. I'm talking about that proposal to come up in future years. Can these monies then be used for other than and put on to special education and then go back?"

Stuffle: "No."

Waddell: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Stuffle, do you desire to close?"

Stuffle: "I would just ask for a favorable Roll Call vote on Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment... the motion carries and the Amendment is adopted. Is there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. House Bills, Third Reading. 14, Representative Yourell... 14, do you want that one called? Out of the record. I assume 27, is out of the
record. 32, is that in or out? Out of the record. 110, Representative Johnson."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 110, a Bill for an Act to amend a Section of the Criminal Code of 1961. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. After some debate I believe the Bill as amended is in the form that evidences the intent that I had when I wrote this Bill to begin with and that is to eliminate the unnecessary and arcane discriminatory language against illegitimate that is contained in Section 9-4, Chapter 38. I believe that Mr. Deuster's Amendment incorporates that general philosophy and I support the Bill obviously as amended and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is a 128 'aye' and 11 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 112, Representative Pierce... out 112. 127, J. Houlihan... out of the record. 212 is just on Third Reading now. 244, Representative Ewing, 244... out of the record. 290, Representative Kempiners."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 290, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a very minor Bill which puts into state statute an authority that the Department of Local Governmental Affairs believes already in the statute, And it relates to filing of a statement of personal property for tax purposes. We had a situation in my district whereby the one assessor sent out the filing forms late and because..."
they were returned late, a business was fined for tardiness. And all this does is state that in a situation such as this, the assessor would have the authority to prescribe a later filing date. It is a very simple Bill and as I said, it basically puts into statute authority, which the Department of Local Governmental Authority feels implies anyway, and I would seek a favorable vote on this.

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? 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? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record.

On this question there are 153 'ayes', no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 321, Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen...."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 321, a Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 321, amends the Probate Act in a technical respect to the effect that the clerk of the court who presently under statutes... after he has held desperate personal property and by definition of desperate personal property is worthless property; after he has held it for a period of twenty-one years he is authorized to destroy such property. All that the Bill does here is to provide that he may otherwise dispose of in addition to destroy. That is all the Bill does. It passed Committee unanimously and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates that he will."

Schneider: "Dan, there is something about the certainty of destruction as opposed to the uncertainty of the language
that your installing. So one of my question is, why are we even changing it when after twenty-one years there would be no questions about how the property would be disposed of, it would be destroyed and cleared. So when you're talking about this being.... taking this kind of property and just disposing of it, how do we know as individuals that there isn't someone who is going to benefit let's say from that property?"

Houlihan: "The background of this and it is very minor, is to the affect that desperate personal property is property which is apparently worthless. However, it may have a value... I'm talking about now, what would be old engraved stock certificates which are worthless. They may have a collectors value. If these could be disposed of other than by it being destroyed by the clerk of the court, the clerk can realize revenue that will come into the county. I would point out that the clerk can take no action in respect to this property for a period of twenty-one years after it has been deposited with him. And anything of course within that twenty-one years period an heir or legacy or a creditor of the estate could petition the court to realize value from this property."

Schneider: "Well, what... if I understand that last paragraph on page 2, Section (c), there is no need necessary unless the court wishes to inform legacy of the loss or change of this kind of property. What I'm fearful of is that if you have what appears to be to many people a worthless piece of property, let's say an old brass hat rack; on the basis of some of my experiences with antiques, that could have considerable value. Now if you're talking about disposing of it and hoping that the money then in turn would be sent to the clerk for..... to the county for funds, it would even seem more important to me that maybe the state should benefit from that. That maybe even the Department of Financial Institutions with this
abandon property division would have a chance at that property because they do have a due process procedure much fairer, it seems to me, than what is presently the law."

Houlihan: "I think you’re making a statement..."

Schneider: "I think that is a combination statement and question. There seems to be room for some strange benefactory. I mean does the affidavit say, Joe Brown got the property, or does it just say that it has been disposed of."

Houlihan: "Well, the present law provides that after a period of twenty-one years the clerk simply destroys the property which is worthless, which is being held by him. All this does give an alternative method of his disposition."

Schneider: "Well, I guess it is the alternative I'm uncomfortable about and I would speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schneider: "House Bill 321, I think has at least on the face of it, a simple concept which gives as the Sponsor indicates an alternative to the court. What I'm suggesting is that under the present law there is no problem of who benefits from what; we identify as desperate personal property. It would seem to me that the law would be better or individuals would be better served if the law was left without any changes so that there is no shady area that some people can benefit from what the court may willing or unwilling identify as desperate personal property without value. So, I would hope either Sponsor could change at least a portion of the Bill, Section (c) maybe to indicate more precisely how it is going to be disposed of and how precisely we benefit as a county or state from those goods. Otherwise, I would have to oppose the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to speak in favor of this Bill because those of us
who have done probate work know that there is the other side of the coin. At the present time if you have a bank account in the bank and it lies dormant for seven years, if you take no action on it, the bank can close it out and send it to the state. So all this does is say that the personal property in the possession of the probate clerk which at the present time can be destroyed. It simply gives an alternative means to the clerk to destroy or otherwise dispose of it. They might find something that is of value by documents and old deeds for example. Those things can be given to museums. I speak in favor of this Bill and I think it is a good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "James Houlihan, do you seek recognition?"
Representative Dan Houlihan to close."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 321."

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? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 123 'ayes', 12 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 383, Representative Richmond, 383... out of the record. 387, Representative Giglio. 387."


Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, This is a Bill that was pulled by the record the other day at the request of the other side of the aisle because they wanted a notification from the township officials that they took no position on the Bill. This Bill as you recall is one that gives the money to the county clerk
47.

or the money from the traffic fines from the county clerk to the county treasurer. I think the Bill was pretty well aired out the other day and I would ask for your favorable vote."


Conti: "Mr. Speaker, this simple Bill that Frank is referring to is actually asking this Legislature Body to make a judicial decision on a court case that is now pending in the Circuit Court of Cook County. I have before me the court case and file number of the court, #74CH858, it was filed in June of 1975. Now, this simple Bill will delete this paragraph in the law which we now have for offenses committed upon any highway outside the limits of the city, village, incorporated area, town or park district, to the County Treasurer of the county of where the offense was committed, except if such an offense was committed on a highway maintained by or under the supervision of a township, township district or a road district to treasurer thereof, for deposit in the road and bridge fund of such township or other district. Now, we have written letters to the Comptroller. At that time it was Matt Daniel, the Clerk of the Circuit Court. And we addressed a letter from the Assistant Comptroller to Richard Belcke and in that letter dated November 21, 1973, these attached copies of letters sent to this office by Anthony Steany, who is the attorney for this litigation. And it appears the subject of his inquiry might probably be within our area of operation, because the clerk of the circuit court of Cook County makes a distribution of fines collected in various courts of the circuit court of Cook County. I would appreciate your responding to Mr. Steany's letter. Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned, if any additional information is required. Now, there hasn't been any answer to that letter as yet. Another letter was sent out on January 16, 1974, by Mr. Selcke.
question you raise is whether a township or a township district or the road district is specifically Lydon township, receive the fine and penalties collected from offenses committed on their highways. Such fines and penalties are not distributed to townships, township districts or road districts. The reason for this is there is no feasible way to identify such highways. The matter has been given considerable thought and the only solution would be to have the arresting officer earmark such violations at the time of the arrest. We came back with it and we showed them a twelve month record of the arrests, as I mentioned before, where Representative Bluthardt passed a Bill here several years ago allowing municipalities or unincorporated areas to contract with municipalities or the sheriff of that county for police protection. And just... I'm not going to belabor this point but just.... I have two months of records here where these fines are earmarked not only the arrest that was made but by the officer who the arrests were made by.... and we show the violation, how many citations were issued, case reports were written, seven case reports were coded, thirty arrests were made and other arrests made on traffic. As I suggested the other day, that in a township like Lydon where we have a large unincorporated area, these fees can range anywhere from eighteen thousand to thirty thousand dollars a year and the road and bridge fund of that township is going to suffer. Now, any county clerk..... any county clerk who does not turn these fines over to a township... I don't know what the word means but I was told that it was misprison of office; and I think that would be the same as of malfeasance of office. And if we pass this Bill, House Bill 387, we are helping that Judge make a decision on this pending legislation that has been before him for two years. To go a step further, we notified the Chief Justice in Cook County, John Boyle.... on June
23rd of 1975, that this letter will correct a prior incorrect and incomplete letter and he apologizes for it. Your attention is called to that Chapter, Chapter 95, which they are trying to clarify here today, that spelling out the violation of the county clerk was now violating the Illinois statutes. It appears that there is little doubt that the practicing Cook County is clearly or is violative of this Section. We notified the Judges involved there and that is Judge Eugene O’Hosecky, Judge Richard LaFever, Judge Walter Dole, Judge Anthony Smegial, Judge Norman Carpus and Judge Ervin Iserman and Judge Paul F. Guarty and that was on June 23, 1975 and we have no response of that letter. So I really understand why we have no response from any of the letters, I could really understand now why this court case has been pending for two years in the circuit court of Cook County; because they are waiting the passage of this Bill. And this Legislative Body will be making a judicial decision for the Judge, the presiding Judge in the court of circuit court of Cook County. I’m asking downstate township legislators, legislators who represent these townships downstate, to take a good look at this clarification of this Section of the law that for years they themselves probably didn’t know... of this Section of the law. And they have probably been losing thousands and probably in the millions of dollars that don’t go back to the road and bridge fund and the taxpayers are suffering in that particular township."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the prior speaker is absolutely correct. And those of us who live in counties that have township government, we have township road commissioners. This would take their money away from the township road commissioner’s fund which is very necessary to repair the township roads, put it in the county and then who knows when we’ll get it back. I
think Representative Conti, is absolutely right and I urge defeat of this Bill, as much as I like the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill had a good hearing in our Committee and to recollection, to the lobbyists to the township government, this has never been paid to any township government under these conditions. It would be a hardship on the county clerk to determine how much money is to be paid. Therefore, nothing has ever been paid and the counties do reimburse townships an allotted expense for roads and bridges. And I think it is a good Bill and would clear up... clarify the situation and I urge a do pass."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We did have a very thorough hearing of this in motor vehicles and the questions that were asked was; is there any townships that would suffer if this legislation was passed? There was no evidence brought before us until Representative Conti brought up the situation of Lydon Township. And I think Representative Conti has pointed out very well the problem that exists or could exist in some townships. The township of Lydon has an extensive amount of township roads and is losing monies that accrue to the amount of thirty to thirty-five thousand dollars if they could get the circuit court to have the money dispersed to the system that the existing statutes provides. This was the information that we asked for in Committee, we ask for from the township association, they could not find it. It took Representative Conti to find it. And I think because of the situation and the pending court case that directs itself to this legislation, that this legislation at this time should not be passed until the case of Lydon township vs. the Illinois Department of Law Enforcement can be resolved. And
if it is resolved in favor of Lydon township, then this legislation should not ever be passed and I would request a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of House Bill 387, because the townships, particularly in Cook County, have never attempted until Representative Conti's recollection of two or three years ago, to make a bonafide attempt to persuade the circuit clerk of Cook County to relinquish the fines that were resulted in citations issued on township roads. Now, the township officials of Illinois have indicated they have no opposition of this Bill. Their only concern was that it would prevent them from levying fines on road obstruction and fences and weed cutting along township roads and so forth, that was their only concern. Now it is about time that, as I indicated to you last week in discussing this Bill, that the townships in Cook County act in a responsible manner rather than react when something happens to them. Now, I can tell you and I dare say there isn't anybody on this floor that is familiar with Cook County government in suburban... in Cook County that can tell you actually if they have ever made an attempt to collect these fines as a result of citation. Some of the townships have less than one or two miles of roads in them, it is a very difficult thing to assess where the citations are issued. Some of the townships in Cook County for example count cemetery roads. And I don't know of any fines that could be levied by citations issued in that instance. But, I would ask that anybody that is a Representative of township government in Cook County to tell me now when the last attempt was made prior to the Lydon case to collect a citations that were the fines resulting from those citations. Instead of that they continue to levy a town
and road bridge tax to provide for the funds to repair and maintain existing township roads. This was a statutory source of revenue for townships that was never taken advantage of. They have never until the Lydon case when suddenly the township of Lydon saw that there was a provision in Chapter 95 for the collection of these fines. And I brought this to the attention of the township officials ten years ago and they said, 'Hell, we don't care about those fines because we can't determine how they could ever be levied.' They said, 'Our only concern is that we not be subjected to not collecting fines for weed cutting or obstruction of roadways and so forth.' So, if they haven't used this statute it is time that it is eliminated and I would hope that you would support House Bill 387.'

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt."

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

You know this is a rather unusual period here that while the law is quite clear as to who is entitled to the fines if any, that this ought to be the burden of the township officials to see that the fines are collected. It would seem to me where the law is so clear that that is the burden of the county clerk to see that the fines are distributed as the law provides. I don't know how old this statute is but it seems to me that Mr. Buzz is trying to throw the burden on the other side, not where it belongs. Second, when he says no township official ever appeared to oppose this Bill, he's talking about a downstate township official that has very little interest or knowledge of the Cook County township government and he really represents only townships outside of Cook County. It just seems to me that what we're trying to do here by this legislation is to render mute the court action that is pending in Cook County. That money is needed by the Township Highway Commission for maintaining the
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio, to close."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Well, I'm somewhat amazed at some of the remarks on the other side of the aisle. As they stated previously, the county clerk of Cook County will be more than happy to give the fines to the townships if only the townships would provide the tickets and tell where the money was to go. The townships don't have any township police. The sheriff and the people that write the tickets -- they don't know if it's a township road or not. And never in the history has the county clerk reimbursed the townships because they don't know how much money and how many tickets and what township to give the money to. And, as I stated before, last year, Senate Bill 1178, we gave the townships fifty million. That is the first time they ever received any money for their township roads. And as far as the judicial system goes, I care less... we're three separate bodies in this state of ours and what we do here is our business. And we can show the judicial system our intent, and the intent here is to correct something and get these county clerks away from the burden that he has by putting this money back into the county. And therefore, using the money where it should be used. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."
Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Yourell, for what purpose do you rise?"

Yourell: "Yes, do we have the opportunity in the new rules to explain our vote?"

Speaker Redmond: "What rule is that, Representative Walsh? I believe you have spoken in debate and that precludes your explaining your vote. The only one that would be excused from that is Representative Geo. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 165 'ayes' and 65 'no's'. Failed... this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. 429."


Speaker Redmond: "Representative Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 429, is a very simple Bill... today when an employee goes to work for a municipality under the Police and Fire Commissioners Act, they are typically on a six month probation period. And under the provisions of House Bill 429, when that employee goes to a training school, that period of time would be exempted from the six month training period. This Bill has the support of the Illinois Municipal League... some of you might be reading an analysis that would indicate that the fire fighters of Illinois are opposed to it. We took care of their problems by Amendment #2 on the Bill that would not exclude training time or on the job training. And I ask your support for the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question.... Representative Schlickman."
Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "What is the need for changing the existing law?"

Miller: "Representative Schlickman, this would give the local municipalities the opportunity to evaluate the qualifications of a new employee for a full six month period. As you know, policemen today for example, go away to a six week training school and the local municipality: then is only given an opportunity to evaluate the qualifications of the candidate for four and a half months, And I think the intention of the original Bill was to allow them a full six month evaluation."

Schlickman: "May I address the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it seems to me that by excluding training time in calculating the probation period we would be discouraging new recruits from engaging in training and thereby, decreasing our confidence as law enforcement officials. And on that basis I would urge a 'no' vote."

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

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. To rebut the thought put forth by the prior speaker, let me point out that when somebody goes away to training school, it does not in anyway reflect upon their ability on the job once they have received training. I don't think we ought to confuse training in a school with actual qualification for a job. More and more we're depending upon sending away our firemen and policemen for training schools and I think we ought to give that local municipality the opportunity to evaluate the candidate on the job in his actual performance and not by the amount of schooling that he has had. And I ask your favorable vote."

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? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 138 'aye' 13 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 434."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 433, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 343, amends the School Code by addressing itself to a change that is greatly needed in the interest of fairness and justice in the establishment of Community Unit Districts. The Bill allows all voters in each district affected in whole or in part to vote on the issue of consolidation of unit districts. While the specific situation that prompted the introduction of this House Bill occurred in Township High School District 214, we have had widespread and encouraging support from educators and taxpayers throughout the state. For purpose of illustration I would, however, like to relate the crises that has occurred in High School District 214, that prompted Representative Chapman, Representative Totten and me to join as Chief Cosponsors in the introduction of House Bill 434. Elementary School District 59, which is in Elk Grove Township, has long advocated a unit district which they feel would resolve some of their financial problems that have been identified with that district for a substantial period of time. Because a proposed unit district would take two of our eight high schools, Elk Grove High School and Forest View from 214, and those high schools represent 27% of our township high school 214, enrollment and 42% of the assess valuation. It is absolutely necessary that all of the people involved have a choice in such action. Extensive hearings were held throughout the district and it was felt by Cook County
Superintendent of Schools, Richard Harwick, that a referendum for a unit district should be denied. I would like to read in part this message to Dr. Cronin; specifying some of his objections. He says: 'Dear Dr. Cronin, I am recommending to you that the petition be rejected which proposes a unit district consolidation in the present Elementary School District 59, with two high schools in District 214 Forest View and Elk Grove. A legal brief is enclosed which details some of the rationale for this decision, although the law does not require that we do so. I am more comfortable, however, in writing you directly to tell you that for months we have heard voluminous testimonies and held hearings in the community, weighed the evidence and come to our conclusion. It seems to us that even the legislation concerning this situation by its very nature should be construed so that breaking districts is the exception rather than rule. We did not find sufficient evidence for us to recommend to you that this should be the exception... on the contrary we believe that after the arguments we heard, a different conclusion is warranted; mainly that the potential for severe distress for some students and citizens is greater than the benefit to be derived. One final point is worth mentioning although it is not connected with our conclusion. There is a seemingly inequity in not allowing people drastically affected by the outcome of such an election to vote on it, that would be the case where the election would be held. If this issue were brought to a vote, only the residents in District 59 would be allowed to cast their decision and tens of thousands registered voters in the remainder of 214 would have no voice in the decision. Unless I am sorely mistaken, one of the major reasons that you cited for turning down a proposed unit district in Will and Grundy County was your comment that there was a genuine possibility of damage to the remaining area because
the tax based wealth would have gone to the remaining area, that is very much the point of this letter. We agree totally with Superintendent Warwick and feel that further... the principle of one-man, one-vote and the Constitutional president said in the Illinois new Constitution which prohibits this annexation of any part of a county without the vote of all the people within the affected county, also applies to the need to allow all of the voters affected by formation of unit districts to vote on the formation of each district. With the current problems facing education today, declining enrollment, inadequate funding and inflation we feel that it would be disastrous to further add to our educational woes, to allow the formation of unit districts without all of the ability of all of the parents and the taxpayers to have a say in the resulting quality of education. We most urgently need your support and your vote on this very important legislation.' Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to join Representative Jenny Macdonald in asking you to vote 'yes' on House Bill 434. In voting 'yes', we are not asking that you say you prefer large districts to small districts. We are not asking you to indicate that you prefer a duel district over a unit district... what we are asking you to do is to vote to give all citizens assistance through its changes and taxes, or in the services provided to provide all citizens that are affected to vote on the proposal. What has happened to us in our northwest suburban area could happen to you. Not only does this kind of situation occur in a area like ours where part of the district that is heavily industrialized is leaving us with their many... but it can happen in rural areas too. This might be you, this might be your good school district, please vote 'yes' on House Bill 434."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, "I have never seen a Sponsor work harder to get a Bill in order. Her witnesses came down on three different occasions.... her witnesses came down on three different occasions, she's made every possible advantage to get this Bill in the proper prospective to be acceptable to all. I would appreciate your support on House Bill 434, something that is certainly needed in her area and it can have long range implications on all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, fellow Members, I also rise in support of this Bill as now amended. I don't know whether those who had some misgivings about it quite understand but I think it is in the best shape possible right now for passage. It protects all the interested parties. It now, as it is stated, allows only the people of the proposed new district to vote on their taxes or their bond issue and I urge your support on this measure. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise too in support of House Bill 434. The question of course is due process and those voters under the present statute who would not be allowed to vote on the makeup of their school district and the effect that it may have not only on the education of their children but their tax base would be deprived unless this Bill is passed. And I would ask your favorable vote on House Bill 434."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also rise in support of this Bill and I want to mention it has two key things that we should keep in mind. Number one, it was mentioned by Representative Totten as far as due process. This is a
situation where the Illinois Office of Education and Superintendent Cronin have made an administrative decision that could reline an entire school district with tremendously detrimental affects to the substantial majority of the district. But secondly, there is an issue to remember; this particular administrative decision could be a precedent, it could be dangerous for any school district in the entire State of Illinois. This is simply the first time it has been made and hurt a district which is within our legislative district, but it could happen to your district too and it would be an extremely adverse affect. I would very much appreciate your support. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffe."

Stuffe: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I reluctantly rise to oppose House Bill 434. Representative Macdonald mentioned that this Bill would provide for one-man, one-vote. In reality this Bill says, not only that all of the people in an affected area would be able to vote on a school consolidation, it mandates that there be two majorities in support of that consolidation, not just a majority in the entire affected area. I can see that instead this Bill says there must be a majority of the voters in favor of the consolidation... of those voters who live in the new district that's proposed, 50% plus there and 50% plus in the area affected which is not in the district. The up-shot of this is, that weighs the vote of those people in the affected area who would not live in the proposed district. Meaning simply...... and it is clear in the Amendment that that's the case. It means simply that the vote could pass 90% 'yes' in the proposed district, get 49% in the affected area, have an overall majority, overwhelming 60 to 70% and the consolidation still could not take affect because of that dual majority. I think that flys in the face of the Constitutional one-man, one-vote provision. I reluctantly oppose it because I talked
I asked her if she would entertain an Amendment to the effect that all vote, there is one majority. She said she wanted to keep the Bill in this posture with two majorities and because of that I cannot support it. It is unfair to the majority and whole area to let the minority overrule them. It doesn't speak the one-man, one-vote as I said. It flies in the face of one-man, one-vote and if you vote for this Bill in this form you're saying that it is going to be a statewide process whether you're for or against school consolidation and I think that should not be the case. Were it the majority of everyone that would be fine, but it isn't as this Bill is written and stated and I will have to oppose it and ask your opposition as well."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."
Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been in considerable discussion with the Sponsors of this Bill, as has the previous speaker. And as many of you know I have put in a decade of service in the General Assembly, primarily with my primary interest in the area of education and hopefully with my primary interest being directed towards what is in the best interest of boys and girls. In my judgement as an educator as well as a Legislator, unit districts provide the best possible educational program. It provides for a K through 12 process, it provides for one school board, they provide for equal educational opportunities for all children in that particular district. Now, I concur with many people, including the Sponsors of this Bill, that the state superintendent has made an error in overruling the decision of the county school superintendent. I was the Sponsor of the Bill that put the state superintendent in the process. We put the state superintendent in the process because we were fearful that county superintendents would be put in an
unattainable position making the decisions on school consolidation. Therefore, we put the state superintendent in the position of being the arbitrator in this type of setting. I believe that the state superintendent made a mistake. I believe that it was an error and had I been state superintendent I would not have made that decision on the basis of the evidence that was presented, even though I am a proponent of unit districts. However, I don't believe we should change the law to the affect that in that in order to overrule this one decision we are going to affect the whole course of school district consolidation in the State of Illinois. Anyone who's familiar with the number of school districts in this state knows that there are too many school districts in this state to provide for what the Constitution requires, and that is effective free public education. You know and I know that the expense of this has about eaten us up and that we're at the point where we're going to have to make some very sufficient decisions in terms of the number of school districts in this state. The State of Florida has sixty-six school districts in the whole state, Illinois has over one thousand. Ladies and Gentlemen, as you know and I know in your heart that that doesn't make any sense. Therefore, I reluctantly arise in opposition to this Bill. I do not agree with the decision that was made by the superintendent, but I don't think because you have one bad tree in the forest that you ought to go in and chop the whole forest down, and that is in effect what we're doing with this Bill; And, therefore, I urge you to vote 'no' on this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We just heard the last speaker speak in favor of this Bill as a Legislator and as an educator; as a teacher. I am also a Legislator and also a teacher and I speak in strong support of this Bill. We
know full well, Mr. Speaker, that the forces of consolidation have been ordering shotgun marriages of school districts for the consolidations for years. I submit, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that we have gone far enough in this. When we come to the area of educating our children, I think that local control is absolutely essential. And the further you take that school away from a local district into a unit district then an even bigger unit district, you remove the element of local control. Mr. Speaker, it is a situation also that from time to time school districts find themselves in financial difficulty and they immediately start looking around for property to acquire especially if it doesn't have any students. You could call them empire builders but they use to call them pirates. And it seems to me that those who are advocating further and further consolidation, further and further reduction in the numbers of districts are no better than the pirates of three hundred years ago. We didn't allow piracy then, we should not allow piracy now. And it seems to me that Representative Macdonald has certainly taken a responsible action in putting out the hanging tree for the pirates in modern education. I strongly support this Bill and ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I strongly support this Bill and ask for your support in this measure. Those who do not care for the particular formula of the referendum majority required should have addressed that situation on Second Reading and let the House work its will. It is a matter now of simple justice of whether you are going to deny one group of people to vote in a situation where their assessed valuation is going to be severely affected by a referendum that is being held in another district in which they have no control.
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Regardless of what formula of majorities you want in the Bill, this Bill must pass in order to give everyone the right to vote on matters that directly affect their own pocketbooks and the education of their children. Please vote 'aye'.

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Macdonald to close."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this Bill has been thoroughly discussed and I regret that we do have opposition to the Bill but I want to again to say that in conclusion, the real issue before you is not on the merits of duel and unit district but it is one of Constitutional right. I believe that the people who have invested in the long born.... the expense and responsibility for viable school district ought to have the right to protect that investment and to have a vote. I urge your support of this Bill, it is badly needed and one which I feel is fair and just. Thank you."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman... of the House. There is no question in my mind that the people in each district affected by the proposition of establishing tax rates and bond authorization, should have a right to vote as well as the voters of the territory to be included in the proposed district. And, I think it is a good Bill, I think it makes common sense and reason and just as Representative Macdonald has said earlier and other Representatives, certainly if you are going to stick people with greater assessments you should give the right..."
to vote on them."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 143 'aye', 9 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 543, Representative Yourell. 543, out of the record. 724."


Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pechous."

Pechous: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

House Bill 724, seeks to amend the Illinois Municipal Code so as to permit water commissions which are formed by two or more municipalities under five thousand population to operate and transmit water... distribution lines to nonmember municipalities within a radius of twenty-five mile from its present borders. The intent of the legislation is to allow municipalities with insufficient or declining water supplies to obtain the needed water from existing water commissions. Now, recently the Metropolitan newspapers, and in fact throughout the State of Illinois, has witnessed that many communities are suffering problems drought and particularly in Chicago and we find a number of communities which are forced to adopt the anti sprinkling ordinances and we find many water commissions that have adequate water supply and are desirous of transmitting that water to nonmembers municipalities. Now, whether they have this limitation in the present statute which this Bill would amend and permit that water distribution to continue upon the contractual agreement between the water commission and nonmembers water communities that desire the input of that water. I would ask a favorable vote on it and I might add that the... there has been no Amendment, it was given the extensive hearing before the Cities and Villages Committee and it did not receive
any negative votes. Thank you."

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

Williams: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I stand in full support of this Bill, we certainly know that one of the major problems facing the communities is the lack of water and I think this is a step in the right direction. Really what it does is, it really gives the water district the same right to go twenty-five miles as municipalities now have that's all this Bill does. I think it is a good one, it is permissive legislation. Certainly the municipalities who are desperately in need of water, this will give them an alternative based on the fact that it may be more economical to go with the water district than it would be with some municipality. This is good legislation and I stand in full support and urge a green vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates that he will."

Stiehl: "Tell me, Representative Pechous, what would happen after the water has been supplied to a community and the contract has expired, could this be used as leverage by a water commission municipality to force annexation?"

Pechous: "Well, that is a rather far fetched question, I don't have the answer at this immediate moment. I would dare say no, it would seem to be highly improbable."

Stiehl: "This wouldn't be.... you don't in your mind..."

Pechous: "No."

Stiehl: "In your mind this wouldn't be the leverage that could bring about annexation..."

Pechous: "No."

Stiehl:"Could it really force annexation to a water district."

Pechous: "I don't see.....whatsoever."
Stiehl: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "By this Bill you would give to a commission which practically is composed of a number of municipalities the authority not only to transport or transmit water to a nonmember municipality but you would also give to that commission composed of other municipalities the authority to set up a distribution system within a nonmember municipality?"

Pechous: "That is correct. But that, however, would only be done through a contractual agreement and the mutual consent of the parties."

Schlickman: "Well, what would happen if after a contract had expired and the commission composed of other municipalities determine certain conditions or terms of the next conceeding contract that were not acceptable to the nonmember municipality?"

Pechous: "I'm sure that possibility would be implicit in any contractual agreement and it would have a clause that would subject it to renewal without any of the dangers which you have presented."

Schlickman: "Well, doesn't it present to the commission... having the authority not only to transmit but to distribute practically life and death control over the operation of that nonmember municipality?"

Pechous: "To an extent, yes. But then look at the other side of the coin at presently, nonmember communities are suffering a declining water supply, they are quite interested I have a... an extensive file before me showing that many of the municipalities wish to become members, at least to open negotiations. Now this Bill would provide that opportunity for them to sit down and address themselves to some of the concerns that you're raising here and it..."
has application not only in northeastern Illinois but also through the entire state."

Schlickman: "Why do you restrict the operation of a commission relative to transmission to only twenty-five miles when today the law simply says, anywhere."

Pechous: "I will yield to Representative Williams, I've..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams, do you desire to answer the inquiry of Representative Schlickman?"

Williams: "I'm sorry I didn't hear the question."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you repeat the question, Representative Schlickman?" Is Representative Jaffe on the floor? If he is, will he approach the podium."

Schlickman: "Why do you restrict the transmission of water by a commission to within a radius of twenty-five miles when now there is an unlimited radius?".

Williams: "That is not true, Representative Schlickman. Actually, the present statute says that they can only serve a member or a contiguous municipality. What this says it's any municipality (a) as being a part of the water district the next immediate contiguous municipality would be (b) and they are not being served or they are being served from some other source but municipality (c) and beyond that wishes to be served by the district. What this Bill says is they can run transmission lines through easements, and so forth that they have to of course get and they will be able to serve now a nonmember or non-contiguous municipality (c), beyond (b)..."

Schlickman: "That can be done now under the existing law and what you're doing is restricting the transmission of water by a commission to a non member municipality which in only twenty-five miles radius of a member of the commission."

Williams: "No the existing statute does not allow them to go beyond the member municipality, they can bring it to the border and I think you may be confusing this with the
right that municipalities have, I believe that municipalities can actually supply water thirty-five miles beyond their border and this will give the water district about the same right that municipalities have. Actually the question as to where municipality will go for its water will obviously be an economic question but this is permissive and it gives an alternative.

Schlickman: "May I... just talk to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I can't think of a resource that is more vital to people than water and without water a municipality is nothing. This Bill on one hand would grant to a commission consisting of a group of municipalities literally life and death control upon another municipality by, after having gotten control of the distribution system within a nonmember municipality, have the power to dictate all kinds of terms and control to that nonmember municipalities as a condition of continuation of water supply. That is just too, too awesome an authority to give to a commission consisting of other municipalities. And on the other hand, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill would restrict or take back the present authority that a commission has to transmit water to nonmember municipalities. It is very clear as you look at page 1, on this Bill and ignore the language that is being added, that a commission now has the authority to transmit water to a nonmember municipality without restriction as to proximity mileage wide. On these basis, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I urgently request a 'no' vote for a ill-conceived, unwell thought out Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pechous to close."

Pechous: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I heard the past speaker address himself to matter but I would
call your attention to again the urgency, the visionary concept that is embodied in this piece of legislation. It deals with matters that are most pressing, that the nonmember community can, in a negotiated setting, establish just want they want to do. It gives them the opportunity to join together and work towards the needs of their respective communities. I would respectfully urge that a favorable vote come forth on House Bill 724. Thank you."

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? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 148 'aye' and 9 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. At this time I would like to turn the speaker's podium over to Representative Jaffe. A very appropriate introduction for Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Members of the Assembly. As you know.... as you know, representing the best looking district in the entire state, with the best looking people both male and female, I would like to make an introduction. We have with us today the girl who is going to be Miss Illinois and she comes from the district that is represented by Representative Pullen, Representative Schlickman and myself. Also, she is represented by Senator John Nimrod who is the Senator from the 4th District. Her name is Elizabeth Kern, she comes from a section that I carry very heavily, Park Ridge and I would now like to introduce to you, Miss Illinois, Elizabeth Kern."

Elizabeth Kern: "Thank you, very much Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. During the great debates of the summer Session of 1975, you selected the monarch butterfly as our official insect. Former House Representative, Senator John Grotberg said, 'I think we should leave the Bill in-
tact with the monarch butterfly as our state insect because it seem to be the only insect in the State of Illinois that has brains enough to go to South America while the General Assembly is in Session. Since I'm going south, to South Carolina, on May 14, to represent this great State of Illinois in the Miss U.S.A. Pageant and since I must wear a costume depicting Illinois during a costume competition, I chose to dress as a monarch butterfly. In the past four years two of my predecessors have won the title of Miss U.S.A., I hope I can continue an Illinois tradition and bring the title back home for its third time in five years. Thank you very much for your time."

Jaffe: "Now, let me say that Miss Illinois is accompanied by Mr. and Mrs. Slyzino and I would like to introduce them, in addition to this let me tell you that I talked to Representative Pullen and she has informed me that after Miss Illinois gets done with her butterfly costume, Representative Pullen is going to wear that costume on the floor of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "If that is Representative district has the best looking males, God help the rest of us. Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 359, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Consent Calendar Third Reading, Second Day, page 6. Representative Schlickman."

Unknown: "You may proceed, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Shall this Bill pass? Let's remember this day. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is a 133 'aye' and no 'nay', the Bill having received
the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Speaker's Table House Resolution 99, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 99, which was approved in Executive Committee last week, requests the Committee on Environment to investigate the DNA Research that is about to be undertaken in our state, in fact our county of Lake, by Abbott Laboratory. Many of you have watched television and read in the paper about the genetic engineering, the instant revolution that is being undertaken in the country now in the way of DNA Recombinant DNA research, which is aimed at taking the displacing genes from one living entity to another and creating a new organism capable of reproducing itself that has never existed in the history of the earth or history of evolution. There is possibility of great benefits for mankind, there is also the possibility of great harm to mankind. Unfortunately there are no existing regulations in our state or in our country for private research such as apt to be undertaken by Abbott Laboratory and they have no opposition to the idea of the proper Committee of the Illinois Legislator and I believe it to be the Environment Committee to look into the matter and determine whether we need guide lines in our state, whether the Department of Public Health could establish them, whether EPA should establish them or whether the Legislator should establish them or whether perhaps we should have a moratorium on DNA research. All this Resolution does is direct the Environment Committee to look into the matter and determine whether we need guide lines and regulations in our state. The Resolution did go to Committee and was approved by Executive and I ask for a vote to do adopt House Resolution 99."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Edgar."
Edgar: "Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think... I agree with Representative Pierce, that maybe we need to look at this but I'm a little confused why we are going to do it in Energy and Environmental Committee, it seems like Human Resources and some other Committee might be the place to do this. I wonder if you would answer that."

Pierce: "The name of the Committee is Environment Energy and Natural Resources and the reason we are doing it in that Committee is because of the danger to the environment not the human that may be very secondary. We may have a danger to plant life, to animal life, we may have viruses on leaves that affect plant life and not even humans, so it is much bigger than human resources, it affects the entire environment in which man lives and that was the Committee that I selected. I think we could sit down and argue about which Committee is the best, I happen to have been a former Chairman of Environment and presently serve on it and felt that was the proper place to go, I received no objections from Human Resources, they're busy doing their thing and that is the reason that I did it. Primarily because the threat is more to humans it is to the entire environment in which we live."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania. Representative Catania. Try Representative Skinner's we know that one works."

Catania: "I thought his might be worn out from over-use. Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates that he will."

Catania: "Representative Pierce, is there any provision for getting expert staff advice? I realize that we have good staff members on both the Democrat side and the Republican side but I think what you're getting into here is a very technical area. Are you planning to hire any biologist or chemist or biochemist to advise on this because what you said in your opening remarks was that the Committee would report back and advise the General Assembly about..."
whether we need to regulate and I think to intelligently make that kind of recommendation the Committee is going to need a lot of expert help."

Pierce: "Yes, John Allen of the Legislative Counsel, our science advisor on the Legislative Counsel, is already working with Sangamon State University and eventually will have to work with the University of Illinois, SIU and our other resources in the state. The present microbiologist of an objective nature into testify. In addition, the scientific community throughout Illinois and the nation is very educated on this subject and is willing to come before us and give their opinions. The National Institute of Health is studying the matter. Unfortunately their guidelines only provide to... only apply to Federally subsidized research programs subsidized by the National Institute of Health and not by those such as the Abbott Laboratory in North Chicago which is a private company. So you are completely right, we'll need expertise far beyond that even of the House Environmental Committee and John Allen of the Legislative Counsel, who's the scientist... who are full time scientists working for the Legislative Counsel has agreed to coordinate the research with Sangamon State and the other universities that have microbiologism in our State of Illinois. And believe me between the University of Chicago, University of Illinois, Southern Illinois University and our other great institutions we have that capability in our state of people who will help us on a voluntary basis."

Catania: "Dr. Allen is going to be available, full time to coordinate all of these other resources, is that correct? So there won't be any extra expense but we will have expert testimony and expert coordination available."

Pierce: "That's right, at this stage we're not asking for a special appropriation of any kind and we also have the Department of Public Health which would be a resource..."
available to us as well.”
Catania: "Well, that makes me a little queasy but having Dr. Allen available full time is reassuring. Thank you."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."
Deuster: "Representative Pierce, I know what the object of the Resolution is but sometimes we here in the House find ourselves voting for Resolutions that sound just fine and the objection of this one apparently is to investigate this subject with a new and novel area of scientific research and I fully support your effort to provide the General Assembly with knowledge and information on a matter that might need some future legislative action. However, quite often these Resolutions have a long list of whereas clauses and some of them, sometime we finally vote on something that is extremely critical of private enterprise. Could you just... I don't have a copy of the Resolution, are the whereass that say that laboratories is doing something questionable or that the great harm has come from this or just what does the whereass, say here so we know we're not voting on anything more critical or substantive than simply asking for an investigation."
Pierce: "Representative Deuster, just to make sure that we don't offend any of your contributors, we don't mention Abbott Laboratories anywhere in the Resolution. They're a good neighbor of ours, in our county and I know I have many many constituents who work at Abbott Laboratories which is immediately adjacent to our district and...."
Deuster: "We have."
Pierce: "We have, you Representative Reed and myself. The Resolution does not mention them nor does it attack in any way the American free enterprise system or private enterprise of which I'm not only a supporter but even an investor."
Deuster: "What does it say?"
Pierce: "It say.... basically it says whereas, the Recombinant DNA
research is being conducted in our country and whereas, some scientists feel that this research could provide danger to the environment in the mankind, whereas, there are no regulations applying now in the State of Illinois or nationally that the House Committee on Environment investigate and determine whether we need... whether or not we need much regulation in the State of Illinois and somehow I left my file on my desk, but I can assure you there is no... here it is in the Journal."

Deuster: "Thank you, very much and I would like to urge support for this good Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I commend Representative Pierce for his Resolution, I think it is a needed one and it is directing the House Committee on Environment, Energy and Natural Resources to investigate and examine the subject and what better Committee could there be to examine the subject but that one and I urge the passage of this very much needed Resolution."

Pierce: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For those of us who are looking in the Digest you will see that there is one 'present' vote in Committee and that 'present' vote was me. And, I would like to just state my feelings on this particular type of Resolution. I think the Sponsor very adequately demonstrated the need for research in this area both in scientific and as well as an ethical sense. However, I don't think that if each of the fifty states engages in this type of research that we're really going come to any major conclusion and I would prefer that the Sponsor amend this Bill to direct Congress which presently has several Bills in front of it regarding this type of research to proceed with the type of research which
I believe is very necessary. For that reason I'm going to continue to voting 'present' on this Resolution, I would hope that that type of vote would indicate my desire for some sort of coordinated effort throughout the country."

Pierce: "To each his own."

Kempiners: "Thank you."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not condemning DNA Research, I'm not praising DNA Research, I'm not trying to stop it but what I'm trying to say is before we do it, because there is no turning back if we create a new type of living organism, a new type of bacteria that does not exist in nature, before we do this at least let's stop a minute and take a look right here in Illinois, not somewhere off in Congress, but right here in Illinois, as to whether or not we need guidelines and we need some statutes or some regulations governing this. I talked to the Counsel for Abbott Laboratories and they understand that there is a need for guidelines, they are going to try to follow the National Institute for Health for guidelines although they do not apply mandatorily to them and although there is no policing of them and they have no objection to the fact that the State of Illinois should take the time to look and see whether we need some guidelines regulations in the state, especially in the absence of any Federal statute or regulations of the present time that apply and, therefore, I ask that the House adopt House Resolution 99, it's not.... it shouldn't be controversial and I hope you all support it."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that we adopt House Resolution 99. 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 are 119 'ayes', 17 'no' and the House does adopt House Resolution 99. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hope that I will have your attention because this is a matter of considerable importance to each Member. The Members of the House will recall that some weeks ago we adopted new rules for the House of Representatives and those rules required that Bills, in order to be introduced for consideration at this Session would have to be filed no later than April 2nd, which is the end of this week. It turns out of course that there has been a problem with regard to Bills or requests being in the Reference Bureau; and this morning the Members of the Rules Committee met and decided to recommend to the Members of the House a slight modification with regard to Rule 27 (b). Rule 27 (b) is the one that requires that Bills be introduced this week. That slight modification is that if a Member of the House requested no later than yesterday a Bill from the Reference Bureau and that Bill is prepared by the Reference Bureau and delivered to the Sponsor after April 2nd, and no later than April 8th, it may be introduced no later than April 8th. That will thus allow Members who filed requests with the Reference Bureau to be able to file the Bill providing the Bill has been finished in the Reference Bureau by April 8th. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have a problem that the Rules Committee had to respond to, we cannot under any circumstances go beyond April 8th, because the period of the vacation recess is the period in which the Bills will have to be printed. And, accordingly the hope is that your requests given prior to yesterday, if they were not too lengthy and do not involve massive statutory draftsmanship because you do bear in mind that every Member of the House has had many weeks and months to be able to prepare requests,
that if those are received by April 8th, they will be filed and would be considered to be in compliance with Rule 27 (b). Any further extension of that would involve our being in a situation in which come later in April, when we'll have to get Bills out of the House, we will have situations of Bills being scheduled without Bills being available. So, accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I would move to suspend the April 2, introduction deadline of Rule 27 (b), until April 8, 1977. As to those Bills requested from the Reference Bureau prior to March 30th, and not completed by the Reference Bureau until after April 2. And after April 8th, of course the deadline of Rule 27 (b) would be in full force and affect."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak in opposition to this motion. We are at a crossroad, everybody knows that we filed too many Bills and that because of the vast number of Bills that are filed, the Committee's are swamped and are unable to give the proper attention. As the prior speaker pointed out, we have had since the beginning of the year to get in... all of our ideas into the Reference Bureau, I personally have two Bills down there that have been there about a month and I haven't gotten them back. The State of Illinois can probably get along without these two Bills and I'm sure that as I have said previously, all of the Bills that we are considering this Session, the State of Illinois has gotten along with for a hundred and seventy-five years without. We can go another two year, the fact of the matter is there must be five or six thousand Bills down in Reference Bureau. If all of these are filed we're going to have the same mess that we've had in previous years. This is a great opportunity to limit the amount of work that we're going to be doing the rest of the Session and I would certainly urge a 'no' vote on
this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

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

Katz: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Houlihan: "Representative Katz, you indicated that all requests that were submitted to the Reference Bureau as of midnight last night would be honored in this condition."

Katz: "Providing the Reference Bureau is able to draft the Bill no later than April 8th."

Houlihan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am surprised and I must say, outraged that the Chairman of the Rules Committee, a lawyer himself would suggest the acting Chairman, excuse me, would suggest such a procedure whereby that, after the fact ruling, what he is suggesting is that some people have had knowledge of this proposal, have made recommendations to the Rules Committee and have also made recommendations of requests to the Reference Bureau and those people with inside information are getting special treatments. I think the acting Chairman is acting out of place, he is being very arbitrary and I think it is a sham, it is a kind of problem we have dealt with time and time again, where certain people are given special privilege whether it is special privilege in how the Bills are drafted, who gets treatment and who gets their Bills considered first or whether it is special treatment as to inside information. I think this rule is atrocious, I think it violates all of our Members rights and I think we ought to defeat this rule."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor of this motion yield for a question? Mr. Katz, having not been on the inside and not knowing that this rule was going to be proposed, I filed a request for a very simple Bill
with the Legislative Reference Bureau this morning. It seems to me that the timing of this, cutting it off at midnight last night might be better, it might serve the Membership better if we were to say, to change it from midnight last night to either noon today which is after the time I filed mine or midnight tonight and it seems to me that that would be fairer, how would you respond to that...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Well, I would like to respond both to you and to the distinguished remarks of the Gentleman from Chicago. It is now the 30th of March, the Bill had to be filed by this coming................this week, we are in that final week and to say that a Member is deceived by the fact that he hasn't, as of Wednesday, gone into the Reference Bureau to have a Bill drafted which he is required to file this week is to me a little.... well, a little unrealistic. This is the week required and every Member of this House has known that this is the week required. Now, the second point I would like to make is, as far as the Speaker of the House is concerned, the Speaker of the House is quite prepared to live with the April 2, deadline in the current rules. It was, in fact, the Speaker's desire that the rule be respected totally and it was only because of other individuals on the Rules Committee who were concerned about the fact that individual Members might have requested a Bill and didn't have it, that the Speaker finally deferred to the views of some other Members of the Rules Committee to go on along with this modified extension. But from the point of view of the Speaker and I will add a number of other Members of that Committee, we share a lot of views expressed so elegantly by the Gentleman from Will, that the State of Illinois will survive without those magnificent Bills being put in and that we have far more Bills already put in and that..."
will be put in this week, that we can handle in the delivery Session that we need to do so and so this Resolution while I'm presenting it, I want to make perfectly clear that as far as I'm concerned I'm presenting the views of a majority of the members of the Rules Committee and the Speaker will not take personally the rejection of this extension and is totally prepared to live with the April 2, deadline that every Member of the House should know about since they have participated in these deliberations. As to the other request of the Gentleman from DuPage, that the last night midnight be extended to the time that he went in at noon today... I would say to you that I have the most tremendous compassion, indeed love for the Gentleman from DuPage, but there comes a limit beyond which I believe we should not go and accordingly I believe that if it did not occur to the distinguished and knowledgeable, erudite and scholarly Gentleman from DuPage, prior to last night that this legislation was essential and needed by the people of Illinois, my suspicion is that the people of Illinois will live without that masterly bit of legislation and so, I would present the motion only in the form that is which has a closing date as of midnight last night."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."

Keats: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House...."

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

Greiman: "To make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your inquiry."

Greiman: "I have read the motion by Mr. Katz and it seems to do much more than merely suspend a rule. It imposes new deadlines and I wondered whether it would not have to be presented as a Resolution under Section 72-C, which required that all Amendments to the rules be by Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian advises me that the motion
is in form in the order in which Mr. Katz has presented it... one week suspension. Representative Keats."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Keats: "Thank you. It is with great trepidation that I rise to question the senior Member from my district, certainly one of its sainted Members of the House and is respected as any man living in America, but I do have a question of my senior Representative. Harold, this thing at midnight last night, I think is ridiculous. If we backed it off two weeks and said, midnight two weeks ago so that those who honestly made an effort to get their Bills in and a lot in the Reference Bureau have simply just tied up their Bill but they made an honest legitimate effort to put it in two weeks ago. If we changed it to that I would still vote against it but I wouldn't consider it a poor Bill. Is that a reasonable alternative to ask for?"

Katz: "Well, since the introduction made by the distinguished Junior Member of the First District, it is very difficult for me to say no to such an introduction. The only problem with regards to your statement and to the request of the distinguished Member from DuPage is that we have a serious problem. Yesterday more than two hundred and fifty were requests were given to the Reference Bureau. They simply are not going to be able to respond to all of those requests and that was the reason for drawing the line as of midnight last night. It was not with the view to being unfair to the Gentleman from Cook or the Gentleman from DuPage, it is, however, that the Reference Bureau is swamped with work and they will simply not be able to prepare the Bills and that was the reason for selecting midnight last night as of the time. To go to the Reference Bureau and ask for a request which requests cannot be met because they simply don't have the
facilities to do it, would be no service. Accordingly, the Rules Committee decided that as of midnight last night that would be the last time at which a request could be made and there was no feeling or desire to give any insider information because no one knew when that was going to be done. Since this is a request of the Rules Committee, since it was adopted in the Rules Committee, I do not believe that I would have the power to modify the rules and accordingly it will have to stand as it is since the Rules Committee adopted it and I'm here only in the capacity of presenting what the Rules Committee adopted."

Kats: "Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative.... please go ahead."

Keats: "I think what you just sort of said was no. Could you answer that in one word."

Katz: "The answer is no, with your asking the question as to whether or not I could consent to a modification which would extend further the time within which a Member could to the Rules... 30 to the Reference Bureau and have a Bill drafted. I do want to point out, however, that under the House Rules, any Member is free to have drafted a member proposal, that is the proposal that Mr. Friedrich and Mr. Matijevich had and time limits do not apply to a member proposal but, as to Bills, the proposal is that the deadline be established as of yesterday for requests and that only to the extent that the Bills are able to be prepared by the Reference Bureau prior to our spring recess."

Speaker Redmond: "Does that answer your question Representative?"

Keats: "Sort of, I want to ask the sainted, senior Representative if you continue to filibuster we will never get them in by March 2nd. But what I did want to say was that thank you very much for the response to whatever my question was.... I have forgotten what it was now."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think some of you are misinterpreting this motion. If you do not pass this motion, then the Bill you take to Reference Bureau today was not going to be introduced by Friday anyway, so it is dead. So, actually you are defeating your own purpose, what this intends to do is loosen it up a little so there is a little leeway for those who would not be ordinary... ordinarily be able to get their Bills in, so I say to you, if you're voting for this motion is helping those people who got their requests in late, if you don't vote for it you're not going to get your Bill introduced at all. So you have a choice, at least this helps a lot of people including the two hundred who put their... two hundred and fifty who had to have Bills drafted yesterday. Now, the Speaker very well pointed out this morning that even now, even with this motion you're going to have a pile of Bills, you know we're limited to fifty Bills in Committee and there is a probably even now that some of your Bills will never get heard. So, if you open it up anymore... there has to be a deadline some place, if you made it June 15, there would still be somebody unhappy. So, this is an attempt to loosen it up a little to help those people who went down at least yesterday."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."

Kane: "Would the Speaker yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Kane: "Sponsor... Mr. Katz..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz... let me caution you that the deadline is liable to expire before Representative Katz answers this question... so."

Kane: "Does this cover Bills that are already drafted and the Reference Bureau only has to type them? If they're taken down to the Reference Bureau to be typed?"
Katz: "The answer is, yes. The answer is, that under the rules a Bill can be introduced only if it comes through the Reference Bureau and so the answer is, that unless the request was made prior to midnight under the Rules Committee proposal that I have presented, unless it was made prior to midnight you cannot file it unless...."

Kane: "You're not distinguishing that...."

Katz: "Unless you are prepared to file it this week, if you file it this week, Representative Kane, if you can get it and file it this week then you don't have the problem. The present rule says that you have got to file it this week and so if you can file it this week, you've got no problem. We're only dealing with the limited situations of people who don't have their Bill this week and we are trying to provide to the Rules Committee was trying to provide a slight relaxation. I understand that my distinguished colleague, Mr. Greiman, has proposed another slight modification of it which I'm not able to make because I'm here simply in a representative capacity on behalf of the Rules Committee and that is what they agreed upon."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand that Representative Greiman has filed a motion with respect to this motion. An Amendment to the motion, by which Representative Greiman is recognized."

Greiman: "Thank...."

Speaker Redmond: "Let the Clerk read the Amendment first."

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion, I move to amend the motion of Representative Katz to suspend the deadline for time in regards to be made to the LRB, from March 30, 1977, to 2:00 P.M., March 31, 1977."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Apparently many of the Members were concerned about the ex post facto affect of this, no one was aware of the deadline obviously last
night that it would be imposed and it opens up another
forty minutes for people to do it. So, that we have
a time at least today when people didn't know of this
deadline and it is extended until two o'clock today and
I just think it is a fair and reasonable thing; I don't
know how many Bills were filed this morning but it is an
Amendment on Representative Katz's Amendment, I would
support Katz's Amendment after that but I would ask that
it be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz, do you care to respond?"

Katz: "No, Mr. Speaker, I think it is up to the Members of the
House that the slight modification apparently will make
some Members feel that there is not a retroactive affect
for it. I have no objections so that even though I do
personally share the Speaker's feelings that April 2,
should have remained and wanted in the Rules Committee
supported April 2, as the date. I have no particular
objection to Mr. Greiman's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Members who are seeking recognition, do
desire to speak to the Amendment? Representative
Gen: Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, did that... I would like to request of
the Clerk if that Amendment said, the 30th or the 31st,
today is the 30th, tomorrow is the 31st. Is this what
you intended?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Till 2 P.M., March 31."

Hoffman: "March 30th. All right so, it is today. Okay, I
can think it is an excellent Amendment, I'll support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "On the Amendment."

Griesheimer: "I had a question on the prior motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Do we have leave to amend the motion
on its face to show by 2 o'clock P.M., March 30th. Is
there any objection to that? The Clerk will amend it on
face to that extent. Now, Representative Schuneman."
Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."
Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. Representative Greisheimer."
Greisheimer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't...."
Speaker Redmond: "I know it."
Greisheimer: "Ask the question on the Amendment to the motion but I would like to ask a question on the basic motion before we cut off the debate here. A quick question to Mr. Katz, if you will. As I understand it, you can bring Bills to the Reference Bureau to approved only as to form, how does your motion apply to these particular Bills because I will wildly start drafting on my yellow tablet."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz...."
Katz: "The rules already provide, Mr. Greisheimer, that in order for this Bill to be introduced it must come through the Reference Bureau and the rules now provide that it has to be filed by April 2, of this week. As I understand it with Mr. Greiman's Amendment, it would say that if a request was made to the Reference Bureau by 2 o'clock today that the April 2, date would be extended to April 8, and that would cover all Bills whether they come through the Reference Bureau because the Reference Bureau totally drafts them or because they are just being put through by form, it would extend that same privilege to all requests to the Reference Bureau for the drafting or the looking over any certification of any Bill that is to be filed here."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz, for what purpose do you rise?"
Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a motion to amend Representative Greiman's Amendment to change that time from 2 P.M. today till midnight tonight. And, I think that is fair so that
every Member of this one hundred and seventy-seven Member Body has notice that he must get his proposals in the Reference Bureau by midnight tonight. I think the key question is notice, if we use yesterday, midnight yesterday and no Member of this House had notice that he had to get his Bills into the Reference Bureau, I think midnight tonight would be the fairest and most democratic way to do it and I have a motion to amend Representative Greiman's Amendment to midnight tonight March 30th."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to table the whole damn works. We, under that rule that's a perfect motion... that's one way of stopping debate, the more Amendments we have the more questions you're going to have killed and we'll never get out of here but I really feel sincerely that we have a deadline right now, everybody has had the opportunity... so I am very serious about tabling the whole damn works."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's motion takes precedence. The question is on the Gentleman's motion to table the motion of Representative Katz. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Motion to table. Representative Geo-Karis, this is a motion to table the motion of Representative Katz. This is a simple majority, if this carries there will be suspension of the rules and the deadline is April 2nd. Come what may. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, could you please state for the Body the affect of this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz, filed a motion to suspend the April 2nd, introduction of deadline that of Rule 27 (b), to provide that in the event a request had been submitted
to the Reference Bureau for the preparation of the Bill, the way it stands with the Amendment is by two o'clock on March 30th, that deadline would be extended until the 8th, in other words at two o'clock today the request had been made to the Reference Bureau and the Bill was prepared by the 8th of April, it would be permitted to be introduced and heard in Committee. Now, Representative Matijevich, has moved that that motion should lie on the table in the effect of his motion if it carries, is that the April 2nd, deadline would prevail, it would be no extension even though Bills had been requested to be prepared by the Reference Bureau and the 2nd of April would be the absolute deadline and that would be the affect of this motion. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 67 'aye' and 95 'no' and the motion to table fails. Now we'll go back... it would be suggested that we ought to take a vote on the motion of Representative Katz....

Mr. Clerk, was that leave to file.... to amend on the face, did we not? Now, what is the reading of Representative Katz's motion now with the Amendment on the face? We have not amended... we have not adopted Representative... well the question is on Representative Greiman's to amend the motion to provide that the.... Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I understand that Representative Marovitz has an Amendment to the Amendment and it seems to me that has to be taken first."

Speaker Redmond: "The Parliamentarian advises me that it would require unanimous consent to amend the Amendment. Suggested that we vote on Representative Greiman's Amendment first and then proceed to Representative Marovitz. The question is on Representative Greiman's Amendment to set forth that the time where the Reference Bureau, the request of the Reference Bureau would be two o'clock on March 30th.
that's today. Those in favor of the Greiman Amendment vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, again would you explain our posture on this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you repeat that, please."

Madigan: "Again would you explain our posture on this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "This is Representative Greiman's Amendment to Representative Katz's motion and the effect of his Amendment would be, permit requests to be filed at the Reference Bureau by two o'clock today as contrasted to Katz's motion which would be midnight last night. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I wonder if we would be allowed to crowd into the Reference Bureau and they could lock the doors at two o'clock like we do at the polling places at 6:00 P.M. Would that be the intent of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "They only do that in Crystal Lake. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 61 'aye' and 83 'no' and the Gentleman's motion failed. Representative Telcser, did you want to make that three o'clock? He wants quarter-after two. Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Now, I have an Amendment that's been filed, the crust of the Amendment is to give everyone of this House notice that they must have their Bills in the Reference Bureau by midnight tonight and I think that gives every Member of the House an opportunity to get his or her proposals together and get it into the Reference Bureau and I think that is what the House is all about, the Democratic process and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on making the deadline midnight tonight."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker an inquiry of the Chair. If this Amendment is adopted are assume... do we assume then that the
Reference Bureau will be open until midnight tonight."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know, you better address that question to the head of the Reference Bureau."

Hoffman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that that would be a sufficient question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "I would agree with the distinguished Gentleman from DuPage, I think the Reference Bureau works for us and if this is our week then they will be there until twelve o'clock at night, they are there many many evenings until late unto the evening and I think if we make a deadline at twelve o'clock tonight and we instruct them to be there working until twelve o'clock tonight taking proposals, then they will be there until twelve o'clock tonight and I think you are correct in that is a very important part of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I am a little surprised that Members stand up and say, well gee, they didn't know this was going to happen... Well actually several weeks ago we passed... adopted the rules that... said the deadline was this week-end and everyone certainly had notice that that was the deadline and I don't know now why they seem so surprised that they can't do it. The Legislative Reference Bureau is working nights now and even then they probably will not be able to get the Bills out by the 8th, so I think what you are doing is having an exercise in futility here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "In response to the Gentleman's remarks, what my objection is and I think what is patently unfair is the fact that last week before we adjourned for the week-end I raised this question as to what our posture was going to be about the rule and there was no response, no response from a Majority Leader or the Minority Leader of substance"
or the Speaker and yesterday, Representative Friedrich, some two hundred and fifty Bills were introduced into the Reference Bureau. Now, somebody had knowledge of the fact that we were going to propose this rule and that's not fair, that gave those people an unfair advantage over the rest of the Members and that is what my objection is. I will abide by the deadline that exists in the rules that we all knew about. That we all should have kept in mind in introducing our legislation, what I object to is some Members had privilege of knowledge of a rule change that gave them undil advantage over other Members and that is just not right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if it is in order I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put, those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it is true that we all knew what the deadline was going to be but some individuals and I'm not one of them, have proposals that are all drafted, all they need is to be typed or all they need is a couple of words changed and they felt that they could bring it down and it wouldn't take very much time. Now, if we're going to have a deadline as to when you can even have those things typed which are already prepared, then everybody in the House ought to know in advance what that deadline is going to be. And, I think it is only fair. I don't think that we're going to find thousands of Bills being put into the Reference Bureau between now and midnight tonight but I do think that if we want to be fair, ought to give everybody an opportunity to get his or her proposals in the Reference Bureau we ought to extend the deadline to midnight tonight and that would include those people who only have things to be typed.
or one or two words to be changed. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on this Democratic Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to amend Representative Katz's motion to extend the time for the Reference Bureau, the request of the Reference Bureau to midnight tonight. Those in favor of the Amendment vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "At the proper time, Mr. Speaker, I would like a verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 71 'aye', 78 'no', the Gentleman has requested a verification... I presume a poll of the absentees, first. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, apparently the Reference Bureau isn't going to be here at midnight tonight but if this goes on much longer I'm afraid we will be."

Speaker Redmond: "While you were forewarned in the early part of the week so... Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, can I be verified early? I wanted to go down to the Reference Bureau."

Speaker Redmond: "Is leave granted to one hundred and seventy-six Members to be verified now and go down to the Reference Bureau. Poll the absentees. Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, can I be recorded as voting 'aye', please."

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Vote him 'aye'. Representative Simms."

Simms: "Please change my vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'. That is Representative Simms. Proceed with the poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams..."
Speaker Redmond: "Record him as 'aye', Adams."
Clerk O'Brien: "Birchler, Caldwell...."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler."
Birchler: "How am I voted?"
Speaker Redmond: "You are not voted."
Birchler: "Vote me 'aye'."
Clerk O'Brien: "Caldwell, Chapman, Conti, Ewell, Giorgi, Griesheimer, Emil Jones, Kosinski..."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski, record him as 'no'.
Representative Caldwell, 'aye'."
Clerk O'Brien: "Mautino, McAvoy..."
Speaker Redmond: "Mautino, 'aye'. McAvoy, is absent."
Clerk O'Brien: "McBroom..."
Speaker Redmond: "McBroom, 'aye'."
Clerk O'Brien: "McClain, Molloy, Mugalyn, Mulcahey,..."
Speaker Redmond: "Aye', Mulcahey."
Clerk O'Brien: "O'Brien..."
Speaker Redmond: "O'Brien, 'aye'."
Clerk O'Brien: "Polf, E.G. Steele, Sumner, Telcser..."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sumner, 'aye'."
Clerk O'Brien: "Telcser..."
Speaker Redmond: "Telcser... your abstention is being verified
Representative Telcser... your abstention."
Clerk O'Brien: "Tipsword, Winchester, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polf."
Polf: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"
Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentlemen recorded?"
Clerk O'Brien: "Not voting."
Polf: "Would you please record me, 'aye'."
Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. What's the count now?"
Clerk O'Brien: "81 'aye', 77 'nay'."
Speaker Redmond: "81 'aye' and 77 'nay', is that a verification
Representative Marovitz? 81 'aye' and 77 'nay'. You requested a verification.... You're winning now do you want
to take a chance."

Marovitz: "I withdraw... withdraw my request for verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. On this question there is 81 'aye' and
77 'no' and the Gentleman's motion prevails, the Amendment
is adopted. Now we revert to the adoption of Representative
Katz's which will read as follows; will you read it
Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "I move to suspend the April 2, introduction
deadline of Rule 27 (b), until April 8, 1977. As to those
Bills requested from the Legislative Reference Bureau
prior to midnight March 30, 1977, not completed by the
Reference Bureau until April 2, and until after April 8th,
the deadline of Rule 27 (b), shall be in full force and
in effect as to all House Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the adoption of the
Resolution. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.
It takes 107 votes. The adoption of Representative Katz's
motion. Have all voted who wished? Representative
Walsh."

Walsh: "You announced, Mr. Speaker that this took 107 votes,
I believe this was the action of the Rules Committee and
as such... just takes 89 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "It is a suspension of the rules, it is not
an Amendment to the rules. It takes 107 votes."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker then I would like to talk in favor
of it. I think the Gentleman's motion is indeed reasonable
and I think there is considerable misunderstanding about
the effect of it. It is a relaxation of the rule with
respect to the introduction of Bills that is necessary
because of the tremendous backlog in the Reference Bureau.
I have had a Bill there for at least six weeks that has
not been delivered to me, now it would be totally un-
just, Mr. Speaker, if people in that position, and I'm
sure there are several in the same position that I am with
respect to that Bill, if they were unable or foreclosed
from introducing their Bill because of this artificial deadline. "I submit to you that this is totally reasonable and that the Gentleman's motion ought to prevail."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain my positive vote and I would just like to say something that a Member of the Rules Committee shared with the rest of us today and that was that he's had a Bill in the Legislative Reference Bureau since December 1st, that he hasn't gotten it back yet. Now, you think that Member hasn't prepared himself and the rest of us in time to get that Bill back, it is not his fault it's not back. It is the Legislative Reference Bureau which hasn't gotten around to it, I don't think we have to extend the rule interminably but I think there has got to be some relaxation for Members who have prepared in advance and who just have not gotten their Bills from the Legislative Reference Bureau and I think the approach were taking here is the most reasonable one that we could come up with and I would urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think in good conscience and in all fairness and equity for the the Membership, this rule should be adopted. I think you should vote for this even if you have to rise above your principle, that's how sufficient this is and so with that admonition I would encourage seven more votes on the board for this good relaxation in the rules."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 104 'aye' and 43 'no', the Gentleman's motion fails. Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I would request a poll of the absentees. I noticed some people reaching for their switches and the
Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Redmond: "E.M. Barnes, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bradley, Breslin, Don Brummet, Daniels, Conneal Davis, Dawson, Domico, Ewell, Farley, Getty, Giorgi, Hanahan, Jacobs, Emil Jones, Klosak, Kornowicz, Laurino, Lechowicz, McAvoy, McClain, McGrew, Molloy, Mugalian, Schisler, Winchester, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

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

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, will you change my 'aye' vote to 'no', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'no'. What's the score, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "104 'aye', 44 'nay'."

Speaker Redmond: "104 'aye' and 44 'nay', having failed to receive the necessary majority the motion fails. I think I'm going to... I don't know whether the Speaker has any prerogative... I'm very seriously questioning the wisdom of having Taylor Pouncey being the Clerk on the night of the second and Jim Taylor be the Speaker. I think... I think we've done a pretty good job today and I see no reason why we should have to work tonight. We're a little bit longer than I thought, I hoped we would finish about a half an hour ago to permit lunch so maybe the Committee Chairman will have an announcement with respect to... or Mr. Madigan, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we postpone Committees, all Committees for one half hour so that the two o'clock Committees would meet at two-thirty and the four o'clock Committees would meet at four-thirty."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you understand that, the two o'clock Committee's would meet at two-thirty and the four meet at four-thirty. Does anyone need to make an announcement? Representative
Madigan... motion to adjourn.... Representative Jones, pardon me, I almost missed you."

Jones, D. "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to rise for an official announcement of the Governor's Prayer Breakfast which will be held on April 21, Thursday morning in Springfield and the invitations for your participation have been delivered to your office and the... this is the annual Governor's Prayer Breakfast and the Leadership on both sides of the rotunda are participating in the program. The speaker is Dave Rawl, the football superstar of the Orland Raiders who is also active in Christian Athletics Program, he will be the featured speaker of that day and if you desire to purchase tickets, fill out the card that has been delivered to you with the invitation and either mail it in or deliver it to me and I will see that it is taken care of."

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

Madison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker you are being awfully nice to us, not having us work tonight and I'm wondering if this is a prelude to your announcement that we'll be here Saturday?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, unlikely."

Madison: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Saturday is the last day to file Bills and I know somebody is going to be here. Representative Kelly, do you seek recognition?"

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Just for a purpose of an announcement that the House Counties and Township Committee will meet promptly at two-thirty this afternoon in room 310."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan on the Adjournment Resolution."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I omitted this at the beginning of the Session. Would the records show that Representative Mugalian is excused because of illness..."
Speaker Redmond: "I think we did do that."

Madigan: "And Representative Giorgi is excused for which... I'm sorry..." 

Speaker Redmond: "We didn't Giorgi but we did Mugalian."

Madigan: "Representative Giorgi is excused and would the Clerk announce his program for the remainder of the day."

Clerk O'Brien: "We'll be in Perfunctory Session for about thirty minutes for introduction of Bills, reading of Committee Reports and Messages from the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I move to adjourn until two o'clock tomorrow afternoon."

Speaker Redmond: "You have heard the Gentleman's motion, those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries and we stand adjourned until two o'clock tomorrow."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following preamble and Joint Resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Joint Resolution #16, adopted by the Senate March 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Committee Reports. Representative Pierce, Chairman on the Committee on Revenue which the following Bills were referred. Action taken on March 29, 1977, reported the same back with the recommendation do pass as amended House Bill 192 and House Bill 199. Representative Taylor, Chairman on the Committee on Cities and Villages to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken on March 29, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendation do pass House Bill 675, do not pass House Bill 323, do pass as amended House Bill 227. Representative Schneider, Chairman on the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken March 29, 1977, reported the same back with

the Bill. House Bill 1269, McCourt. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill.


House Bill 1271, Marovitz. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill.


House Bill 1273, Huff. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Chicago Community Schools Study Commission. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1274, Huff. A Bill for an Act creating the Chicago Community Schools Study Commission. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1275, Terzich. A Bill for an Act to amend sections... to amend an Act to create sanitary districts and to remove obstructions in the Des Plaines and Illinois rivers. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1276, Breslin. A Bill for an Act relating to an Act to criminal law and to repeal Acts and parts of Acts herein named. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1277, Chapman. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act providing matching grants for scholarship programs established by student organizations at state supported colleges and universities. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 1278, Von Boeckman. A Bill for an Act to amend the Credit Union Act. First Reading of the Bill.


House Bill 1281, Abramson. A Bill for an Act to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill.


House Bill 1283, Bartulis. A Bill for an Act...
Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1298, McGrew. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. Introductions and First Reading, Constitutional Amendments. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #29. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 80th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of this State, at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this Resolution a proposition to amend Section 6 of Article IX of the Constitution to read as follows: Section 6, Exemptions from Property Taxation. The General Assembly by law may exempt from taxation only the property of the state, units of local government and school districts and property used exclusively for veterans' organizations, agricultural and horticultural societies, and for school, patriotic, religious, cemetery or charitable purposes. The General Assembly by law may grant homestead exemptions or rent credits. First Reading of the Constitutional Amendment. No further business, the House stands adjourned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>House to order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reverend Krueger</td>
<td>Prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Roll Call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>Messages from Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Committee Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>Introduction and 1st reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>10:08</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Consent Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 257, 2nd 584, 585, 593,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>637, 653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>3rd Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>General Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lechowicz</td>
<td>Excused absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Excused absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>HB, 2nd reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 43, 2nd, no CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 91, 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deuster</td>
<td>Amendment #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10:16</td>
<td>Houlihan, D.</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deuster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Yield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Yield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deuster</td>
<td>To close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Amendment #3 adopted hold on 2nd. Amendment #4 HB 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:21</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deuster</td>
<td>To close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>Amendment adopted 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Motion suspend rules for posting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madigan</td>
<td>HB 117, 2nd, no CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 155, 2nd CA#1 adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Floor Amendment #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lucco</td>
<td>HB 117, 2nd, no CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>HP 155, 2nd CA#1 adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Houlihan, D.</td>
<td>HP 155, 2nd CA#1 adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Floor Amendment #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10:32</td>
<td>Steele, E.G.</td>
<td>Floor Amendment #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Floor Amendment #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McGrew</td>
<td>Floor Amendment #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Floor Amendment #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lauer</td>
<td>Floor Amendment #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Houlihan, D.</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lucco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10:40</td>
<td>Stiehl, C.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ebbesen</td>
<td>Yield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lucco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>Lucco</td>
<td>To close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steele; E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Amendment #2 fails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schlickman</td>
<td>Withdraw request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 232, 2nd no CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 251, 2nd, no CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Amendment #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10:49</td>
<td>Deuster</td>
<td>Leave to table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Tabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>Amendment #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:52</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Amendment #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deuster</td>
<td>Explain vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td>Withdraw Amendment #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Withdraw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>Floor Amendment #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:55</td>
<td>Deuster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Leave to table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Houlihan, D.</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deuster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Kosinski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>11:01</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deuster</td>
<td>To close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Amendment #4 fails, 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>11:06</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Hold on 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 261, 2nd, Amendment #1 adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>HB 281, 2nd, no CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>Fiscal note not furnished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>HB 308, 2nd, CA 1 &amp; 2 adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Houlihan, D.</td>
<td>TOOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>11:08</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>HB 318, 2nd, CA #1 adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>Floor Amendment #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Amendment #2 adopted, 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>Amendment not printed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O'Brien, D.</td>
<td>Can we get back?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O'Brien, D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>11:10</td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 374, 2nd, no CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 392, 2nd, no CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>Floor Amendment #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schlickman</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hart</td>
<td>Amendment adopted, 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>HB 407, 2nd, CA #1 adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>HB 408, 2nd, CA #1 adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>HB 421, 2nd, CA #1 adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Amendment #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 451, 2nd, no CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 485, 2nd, no CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 536, 2nd, Amendment #1 adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:15</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 537, 2nd, no CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>538, 2nd, no CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 602, 2nd, CA#1 adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 603, 2nd, CA#1 adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yourell</td>
<td>Asks to hold on 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McMasters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>HB 603 &amp; 604 held on 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 618, 2nd, no CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 348, 2nd, CA #1 adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>Floor Amendment #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O'Brien, D.</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Amendment adopted, 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O'Brien, D.</td>
<td>Co-sponsors, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Leave granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 632, 2nd, No CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 679, 2nd, Amendment #1 adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Totten</td>
<td>Leave to bring HB 212 to 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Leave granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>11:25</td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>Amendment #3 HB 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:25</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:25</td>
<td>Houlihan, D.</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:28</td>
<td>Schlickman</td>
<td>HB 509 Leave to return to 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Leave granted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>Amendment #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:28</td>
<td>Schlickman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:33</td>
<td>Conti</td>
<td>Amendment #1 adopted, 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>No objection to Amendment #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Houlihan, D.</td>
<td>Amendment adopted, 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:33</td>
<td>Stuffle</td>
<td>HB 591, 2nd, Amendment #1 adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>Floor Amendment #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stuffle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waddell</td>
<td>Yield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stuffle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:33</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:33</td>
<td>Stuffle</td>
<td>To close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>11:35</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Amendment #2 adopted, 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 110, 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 290, 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kempiners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>HB 290 passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Houlihan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 321, 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Houlihan, D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Yield?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Houlihan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>11:44</td>
<td>Geo-Karis</td>
<td>Speaks in favor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Houlihan, D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>HB 321 passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 387, 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>Giglio</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-49</td>
<td>11:47</td>
<td>Conti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geo-Karis</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Von Boeckman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Totten</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yourell</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bluthardt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Giglio</td>
<td>To close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>11:01</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yourell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>HB 387 lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 429, 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>11:05</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>11:09</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>HB 429 passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 434, 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57–58</td>
<td></td>
<td>Macdonald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>11:15</td>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>Supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>12:16</td>
<td>Keats</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stuffe</td>
<td>Oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>Urge no vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lauer</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pullen</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>12:26</td>
<td>Macdonald</td>
<td>To close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>12:29</td>
<td>Geo-Karis</td>
<td>Explain vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 434 passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>HB 724, 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stiehl, C.</td>
<td>Yield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pechous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-69</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:35</td>
<td>Schlickman</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pechous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schlickman</td>
<td>Repeats question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:35</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pechous</td>
<td>To close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:40</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>HB 724 passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jaffe</td>
<td>Introduce Miss Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miss Illinois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>12:44</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Consent Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>HB 359, 3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Passed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td>HR 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catania</td>
<td>Yield?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deuster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>Géo-Karis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>12:55</td>
<td>Kempiniers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>12:56</td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>12:56</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pierce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kempiniers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td>HR 99 adopted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>Katz</td>
<td>Rules, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leinenweber</td>
<td>Objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1:05</td>
<td>Houlihan, J.</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>Keats</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1:10</td>
<td>Greiman</td>
<td>Parliamentary inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keats</td>
<td>Yield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>Katz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>1:16</td>
<td>Friedricks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>Katz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Katz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Leave to Amend motion on face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>1:22</td>
<td>Greisheimer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Katz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Motion to amend Greiman's Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marovitz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Matijevich</td>
<td>Move to table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Motion to table fails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Skinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Motion fails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marovitz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marovitz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Friedrich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>1:35</td>
<td>Houlihan, J.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ebbesens</td>
<td>MPQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marovitz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marovitz</td>
<td>Requests verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:37</td>
<td>Cunningham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steczo</td>
<td>Recorded as aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>Polls absentees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Birchler</td>
<td>Vote me aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>Vote me aye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1:42</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>81 ayes, 77 nays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marovitz</td>
<td>Withdraw request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:42</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Amendment adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>Reads Katz motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>Walsh</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kempiners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:47</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>Poll absentees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Change to no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:47</td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td>Motion fails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madigan</td>
<td>Suggest postponed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:50</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jones, Dave</td>
<td>Prayer breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Announcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Madigan</td>
<td>Excused absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>Perfunct for 30 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Madigan</td>
<td>Adjourn til 2:00 Thursday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-102-103</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clerk O'Brien</td>
<td>Messages from Senate, introduction and 1st reading. Adjourn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>