

1.

Doorkeeper: "Members of the House of Representatives, the House will convene in fifteen minutes. Thank you. All persons not entitled to the House floor please retire to the gallery. Attention, all Members, the House will convene in five minutes. Thank you."

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

Rev. Krueger: "Oh Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen.

Wendall Wilke said: 'Any Member of the Minority Party, though willing to die for his country, still retains the right to criticize the policies of the government. This right is embedded in our constitutional system.' Let us pray. Almighty God, the Creator and Giver of all life, who hast made man to be of Thine own image; we come to Thee this day with thankful hearts for this gift. We are grateful for the order that Thou hast established whereby mankind has been given the direction, the authority and the choice to govern himself. May we here who are the chosen Representatives of the State of Illinois, constantly remain faithful to the trust to which we have been elected; constantly be aware of the opinion, both favorably and unfavorably of those whom we represent; constantly protect the democratic process which is alone to be found in our country. May all that we do be for the good of all the people and perpetuation of our constitutional system. We this in the name of Our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Approval of the Journal."

Clerk O'Brien: "44th Legislative Day, Tuesday, April 26, 1977, four o'clock p.m. The House met pursuant adjournment. Speaker in the Chair. Prayer by Father William Krueger, Chaplain. By direction of the Speaker, a Roll Call was taken to ascertain the attendance of Members as present as follows."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with the reading of Journal #44 of April 26, 1977, and Journal #45 of April 27, 1977. And I move that they be approved."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. There any



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

discussion? The question's on the motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries and the Journals are approved. House Bills, Third Reading. On House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 14. Representative Madigan, are there any excused absences on the Democratic side?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the record show that Representative Kornowicz is excused because of illness and that Representative Giglio is excused?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Hearing none, the record will so show. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the record show that Representative Dyer and Representative Kucharski are absent due to illness? And I would like to announce at this time, Mr. Speaker, that we have back with us today, Representative Dave McAvoy, in the back of the chamber back from several long weeks of surgery. Welcome back, Dave."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection to the excused absences? Hearing none, the record will so show. 14."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 14. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell. Out of the record. 15."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 15. Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 16."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 16, Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 21."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 21, Hanahan."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 27."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 27, Ebbesen."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record request of the Sponsor. 32."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham. Out of the record. 42."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 42, Mautino."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 65."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 65, Greiman."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 75."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 75, Skinner. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Sanitary District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I must admit this calling of the Bill today means I'm fairly brave since I don't see that many people here. But why don't we try to wake people up and see if we can get them over here and get enough people to pass some Bills. House Bill 75 is a Bill which will make equitable the appointment process for Sanitary Districts in one city and in one county. No Sanitary District that covers more than one municipality or goes across county lines would be affected by this Bill. So we're talking about a very small number of Sanitary Districts. The ones that asked me to introduce this Bill or that is the area is the Village of Lake in the Hills. Now, apparently what's happening is that municipalities, some municipalities in the state do not have a very good working relationship with their Sanitary District Trustees. And the reason is pretty easy to figure out. And that reason is that right now, the three Sanitary District Trustees are all appointed by county government. None are appointed by the village government. That seems inequitable to me since Sanitary District functions are municipal in nature, rather than county in nature. They have a great deal to do with growth and it seems to me that a municipality should be able to control growth through using sanitary sewers. Now, what this Bill says is as long as 60% or more of the assessed valuation is outside of the city or village limits, the County Board will continue to make two-thirds of the appointments to the Sanitary District Board. That is, they will appoint two out of three. Once this magic line which we admit is an arbitrary line of 60% is crossed, then the village or the city would make two-thirds of the appointments. In effect, giving control of the Sanitary District Board to the village or the city Board. There is a phase-in process which is fairly logical, nobody gets kicked out of office. They're replaced as their terms run out. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to attempt to answer them."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any questions? Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Representative, I'd like to ask you a question. I've got



a Sanitary District in Cook County, Chicago Heights, that goes between Cook County and Will County where there is an overlap of two counties. And I just wanted to ask you what do you do in this type of a situation as far as consolidating or eliminating the district."

Skinner: "This Bill does absolutely nothing to the appointment procedure for Sanitary Districts across county lines. The Legislators in the districts that cover that Sanitary District would continue to appoint the trustees."

Kelly: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "May I ask the Gentleman a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schoeberlein: "We happen to be in 1917 and we in the Legislature have been appointing the members of the... because we are in two counties - Kane and Kendall. The major portion is inside the City of Aurora. Heaven help us if the county is ever going to make appointments cause this has been operating good since 1917. How will this affect us?"

Skinner: "Representative Schoeberlein, it will have no affect whatsoever on that Sanitary District because that Sanitary District is in two counties."

Schoeberlein: "It's well operated and is not begging for money at any time. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Matijevich: "Yeah, Representative Skinner, we have a Sanitary District, the North Shore Sanitary District, within one county. Of course, we operate under specific Act, the North Shore Sanitary District Act, and I'm going by what you said in debate. We just passed legislation last Session which allows us to elect by vote of the people, the trustees to the Sanitary District. It's working out real well. We finally got a couple of Democrats on the Sanitary District, North Shore District. I don't want to do anything to disturb that in any way. Does this in any way harm that?"



Skinner: "It will not. As you know, there are numerous Sanitary District enabling Acts. This amends the Sanitary District Act of 1917 and that is not your Sanitary Act. Even if it were, your Sanitary District Act, it would not affect the North Shore Sanitary District because the North Shore Sanitary District serves more than one municipality."

Matijevich: "You're right. Thank you very much. I appreciate that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMasters."

McMaster: "Will the Sponsor yield to a couple of questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Skinner: "Certainly."

McMaster: "Cal, just how many Sanitary Districts do you feel this is going to affect?"

Skinner: "Well, from the testimony in the Committee, I think we did not identify very many, frankly. There were not more than a handful."

McMaster: "Well, the reason I'm asking, Cal, is because I know a couple of Sanitary Districts in my immediate home area that are very much against this. Can you tell me, are these Sanitary Districts as a whole over the state in support of this legislation? I said, are they in support of this legislation?"

Skinner: "As a whole?"

McMaster: "Yeah."

Skinner: "As a whole, I can't imagine they're being interested one way or another since it doesn't affect very many of them. I know that they were violently opposed to the unamended version which would have abolished, heaven forbid, a tax district in the State of Illinois once the... if the boundaries of the Sanitary District ever became contiguous... coterminous."

Speaker Redmond: "Contiguous."

Skinner: "No, coterminous is the word I'm searching for, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for your helpful assist however. My original intention was just to abolish the Sanitary District and to give it to city government. But that, as you know, has been amended out and now Sanitary Districts, the Sanitary District will exist forever as far as the law is concerned."



McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I do not know of a single Sanitary District or the Boards of Trustees as such who are in favor of this legislation. In fact, all of the ones that I have talked to are very, very much against it. It is my understanding that the state organization of Sanitary District Boards is against this legislation. I believe, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, that this is specific legislation directed at maybe one or two Sanitary Districts in the state. I think it becomes a problem when we are in the position of enlarging the statute for specific, individual cases. I would urge a 'no' vote upon this Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Kempiners: "One of the concerns that I have and there is a Sanitary District in my district that this Bill may affect. One of the concerns I have is the municipalities using this type of service and dominating this type of board to perhaps force annex somebody into their municipality who may not want to be in there. Do you have a built-in protection either in the existing law or in your Amendment to the law that would protect unincorporated areas that would be in that Sanitary District from any type of harassment by a board which would be dominated by a municipality?"

Skinner: "No, there are no such protections. As a matter of fact, this is the first time the issue has ever come up. If you have any suggestions on how such protections could be built in, I'd certainly be willing to consider them."

Kempiners: "Well, the reason I bring this up because in another type of public utility, I have a situation where a municipality owns an electric company and it is increasing the rate. And in this case, however, more people live outside the municipality than in that subscribe to this service. And the only way I could see that you could protect the people would be to give them some sort of appeal, for example, to the Illinois Commerce Commission. But



I would be concerned about some of the aggressive municipalities we have in this state maybe using this as a means of annexing territory that do not want to be annexed to their municipality."

Skinner: "Well, that's a very interesting question. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think that perhaps what I might want to do is stick an Amendment on that would prohibit any Sanitary District from using that type of influence. So I wonder if it would be possible to take this out of the record at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. 80, Representative Deuster. Out of the record. 96, Lucco."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 96. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 96 affects counties, only counties under five hundred thousand. It leaves the judges and... well, election judges the minimum of twenty-five dollars but it permits the County Board to raise the maximum if they so desire from thirty-five to forty dollars per day. So this is permissive legislation. It permits the County Boards of counties under five hundred thousand dollars to raise or increase the judge's pay to forty dollars per day if they so desire. And I solicit an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ryan: "Representative Lucco, is this a permission Bill for the counties?"

Lucco: "Yes, it is."

Ryan: "It's not mandatory?"

Lucco: "Definitely not."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "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? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 90... 100 'aye' and 5 'no' and the Bill



having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 127, J. Houlihan. Out of the record. 134, Telcser. 134, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52 and 54 are all out of the record. 157."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 157, Stiehl."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl. Out of the record. It's been represented by Representative Ebbesen that 1072 is one that we might go with. So, Mr. Clerk, 1072."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1072. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Metropolitan Civic Center Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, since there don't seem to be too many Members that wish to be calling, I'd appreciate the opportunity to move this Bill. It really is a Bill that passed out of the House and Senate and was vetoed by the Governor and was overridden in the House and failed by two votes in the Senate and only changes the figure six hundred million back to three hundred million which would authorize the County Board having an assessed valuation or any county having an assessed valuation of at least three hundred million dollars to... of assessed valuation as far as real property is concerned, that by ordinance or Resolution it provides them with the opportunity at the local level to form a metropolitan exposition auditorium authority. And I know of no opposition to the legislation. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I could ask the Sponsor of the Bill a couple questions. Representative Ebbesen, how many counties would this include in addition to those counties that are now authorized to proceed with the metropolitan civic center?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, it would include nine additional counties - Adams, DeKalb, Kankakee, Livingston, Vermilion, Whiteside, McHenry, Grundy and Knox. And I would also like to add, Representative Simms, and for the benefit of the House that DeKalb County has



had a large group of the Sycamore Farmers, the DeKalb County Farm Bureau, the Univeristy, the City of DeKalb and the City of Sycamore working on this project for probably about seven years. And the only thing they need is some authorization to proceed."

Simms: "Could you tell me how much money is now available in the fund for downstate civic centers that is available at the present time?"

Ebbesen: "Representative Simms, perhaps since Rockford and Peoria and so forth have moved in this direction, perhaps you could better tell me. I'm not sure."

Simms: "Well, there's about sixteen million dollars that's left. I'd like to speak in opposition to this Bill. The original intention of the Civic Center Act was to provide for downstate civic centers throughout the State of Illinois in the large, geographical, metropolitan areas of the state. What this further does, it expands that whereby we are, under this legislation, there could be a multitude of civic centers built in downstate Illinois. And very frankly, there's not enough money in that fund now to fund those civic centers that perhaps would qualify under that legislation, let alone add eight more civic centers. And I am in opposition to this Bill for the basic reason that it's not sound on a financial basis. Illinois cannot afford all these additional civic centers throughout the State of Illinois. And for this reason because of the financial ramifications of this legislation and the additional funds that it would cost the State of Illinois to place into the Agricultural Premium Fund to fund each of the civic centers if this Bill were to pass with our economic condition in Illinois, that we could not afford it. And for this reason, I am opposed to House Bill 1072 and I would urge that there be a red vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill and to disagree with Representative Simms. It seems to me that the position which is being advocated by Representative Simms is that certain cities downstate ought to be able to participate in the civic center construction while others should not. And coincidentally, Representative Simms city is participating and he's proposing that we



should not be able to benefit from the largess which his city has partaken of. This Bill is designed most particularly to assist in the construction of the civic center in DeKalb. The Bill was offered to the General Assembly during the last Session and approved. I think it's a good Bill. There's sufficient money in the fund to cover the construction of this center just as there is to cover the construction of the centers in Springfield and Peoria and I would support the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Since my county's name was used in debate, I think I ought to stand up and inform the General Assembly that I have yet to receive even the hint of a request that McHenry County would be interested in ripping off the State like the other cities that have civic centers have done in the past. Frankly, I would rather have the money go from the Agricultural Premium Fund to the General Fund and then to the State Education Formula."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question or two."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Giorgi: "Representative Ebbesen, refresh my memory. I don't recall how these bonds are funded or paid off. Can you tell me?"

Ebbesen: "Well, as I recall, it was something like seventy-five million dollars and you know how they're funded and how they're allocated. And according to the information that I have that anyone that comes up with a state-approved program is eligible for a certain portion of these funds."

Giorgi: "No, no. Where does the money come from to fund that fund is my question?"

Ebbesen: "Where does it come from?"

Giorgi: "Where do the dollars go under to come into that fund?"

Ebbesen: "Well, wasn't there a seventy-five million dollar bond issue of some type?"

Giorgi: "No, no bond issue."

Ebbesen: "There wasn't? According to Lee Schwartz, I have in front of me, informed me earlier this year that that seventy-five million bond fund..."



Giorgi: "No, that's not correct."

Ebbesen: "Is that not correct?"

Giorgi: "There's no such thing as a seventy-five million dollar fund.

Joe, I think you ought to know your Bill better than you do before you come up here and ask for support for a civic center funding.

There is no bond issue."

Ebbesen: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "There is no bond issue sold for the civic centers. The bond money is sold upon application by a civic center. And the money comes from race track gambling. That's the point I wanted to make."

Ebbesen: "I realize that, but I wanted you to say it."

Giorgi: "...the General Assembly to know that DeKalb isn't ashamed...

DeKalb and Sycamore in that area in downstate are not ashamed to take gambling dollars for a civic center. I think that's the thing that should be told to the public. That seventy-five million dollars comes from racetrack gambling dollars. Then it's laundered and then it's put in the civic centers and metropolitan exposition authority bonds. Get the facts. You're ashamed to vote for the lottery Bill, you're ashamed to vote for raffles and chances..."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's out of order. Confine your remarks to the Bill."

Giorgi: "You're right, Mr. Speaker. But I think they ought to admit they want to take gambling dollars with both hands to build civic centers. That's what I think the public ought to know."

Speaker Redmond: "So does Rockford. Representative McMasters."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, may I just take three seconds here to respond that I want Representative Giorgi to be reminded that I did vote in favor of the Lottery Bill when he had that stipulation in there that called for 100% of the dollars to go to the Common School. But it seems that got changed somewhere along the line and I voted 'no', 'yes'."

McMaster: "If I may speak against this Bill. I'm in agreement with Representative Simms. I think that we have a number of priorities in this state and I just think that to pass legislation that would permit more civic centers to be built, is a little bit idiotic at



this time. I think we need the funds elsewhere. Joe has said that my own county, Knox County, would be included in those possibly and I think probably, who would be eligible to build a civic center. But I think that would be nonsense to spend a lot of our own local money and state money to build a civic center in Knox County. I think it's silly and I think we have enough civic centers now in the process of being built. And I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have two requests. Based on the fact that there seems to be a little bit of apprehension on the part of some of the Legislators and if we get into a verification, I doubt if we'd have sufficient votes, perhaps at the call of the Bill. And with that in mind, maybe I ought to take it out of the record. And the second request that I have after Representative McMaster's speech, could you find me a new desk?"

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. Representative Polk tells me that he has a noncontroversial one. 261. Anybody thinks that they have one that won't have any problems with, please let us know. Representative Polk. Stand up and seek recognition, and we'll call you. As long as Walsh isn't here, we can do this. Representative Polk."

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. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "The, Amendment #1, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, changes from the Secretary of State's office to the Department of General Services. There was some problem with Secretary of State. The Department of General Services said they'd be glad to do it. The Bill got out of Committee without any problems and I would appreciate a do pass."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any questions? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative D.L. Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "I have a question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker. Was there



a fiscal note requested on this and was there one filed?"

Polk: "Yes, it's in the Digest."

D. Houlihan: "It says fifteen thousand dollars. What... if this is going to be done at cost, why should there be any fiscal implication to this?"

Polk: "The Department says that their monies comes out of the General Revenue. When they collect money back for the flags, they'll put it back in the General Revenue but it will not show in their budget. So it will cost them fifteen thousand dollars the first year to purchase the flags and the money goes back in the General Revenue. It'll be no cost to the state, however."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 114 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 281. Representative Polk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 281. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

Polk: "House Bill 281 will directly affect the state parks in Illinois that have restaurants. I wanted to make that very clear. Only the state parks that have restaurants. Presently, all restaurants throughout the state must close or must quit serving alcoholic beverages at ten o'clock. We've had a request to change that from ten o'clock until midnight. It will affect four restaurants in the state. One of them being Blackhawk in my district. There is no off sale liquor allowed. It's simply cocktails that are served while you're having dinner. We have in most of the restaurants, they have entertainment, bands that play until midnight and they requested this. There was no opposition. In fact, the Department of Conservation is for it."

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

Geo-Karis: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Polk: "Yes."

Geo-Karis: "Representative, there is a state park, you know, in Lake



County. Would this affect the state parks, the Illinois Beach Lodge that we have in my county, too?"

Polk: "If your Lake County Park would get an authorization to sell alcohol, yes, it would."

Geo-Karis: "They have. All right, I'll speak in... I'll support the Bill then, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Conti."

Conti: "I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "I'll be glad to."

Conti: "Who'll be responsible under the Dram Shop Act with the extended hours?"

Polk: "The state would be as responsible from ten till midnight as they are presently at ten. I'd like to point out, too, that through... there's only been one arrest in the past six months of any person intoxicated and that had nothing to do with the park that sold alcohol."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 102 'aye' and 12 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 471, Representative Stuffle."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 471. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to take 471, 472 and 473 on the same Roll Call?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I would object to that, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Objections have been raised. 471."

Stuffle: "Okay, House Bill 471 is an Amendment to the State University Retirement System. What it does, it provides that for future retirees, the maximum amount of pension allowable shall be 75% of the final average salary. This is consistent with all the other systems in the state. It sets a flat level which, as I said, is



consistent now. Various people have different amounts that they can get in maximum. This is supported by the Pension Laws Commission and it received a unanimous vote in the Committee. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Would you clear the board so I read the... 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? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 123 'aye' and 3 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 472."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 472. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffie."

Stuffie: "House Bill 472, again, went through Pensions and Personnel with unanimous fifteen to nothing vote. It changes the board structure for the University Retirement System. It's in accordance with the proposal, the actuary of the Pension Laws Commission and I would again ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Johnson: "The Spncsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Johnson: "What does the Bill do, Mr. Stuffie."

Stuffie: "Representative Johnson, what the Bill does is to add some participants to the Pension Board. It was suggested some time ago. In fact, I understand in two different reports from the Pension Laws Commission by the actuary that this Board needed better participation from the actual Members. There was some objection to putting an annuitant on the Board so I removed that provision by Amendment in the Committee. So it, in effect, it adds to participant employees to the Board and it takes off the Director of Registration and Education because he no longer serves a function with regard to the universities. At one time, he had a regulatory authority over the teachers colleges. That's no longer the case."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have



all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 119 'aye', no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 473. Representative Stuffle."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 473. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Again, this Bill is a Pension Bill dealing with the University Retirement System. It, too, passed out unanimously from the Committee on Pensions and Personnel. It has two basic features. It cleans up the language with regard to the employer funding aspects within the University Retirement System. And secondly and most importantly, it provides that there shall be no taking of employee contributions to meet the state's share of pension costs in this system. In a number of years, the state's pension share has not been met. They have dipped into the employee earnings, assets and contributions to meet that share. That's inconsistent with pension law policy to do that, so I introduced this Bill which also has the approval of the Pension Laws Commission as well as I said the unanimous approval of the Committee on Pensions and Personnel. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is... Representative Keats."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Keats: "While I think this idea sounds wonderful, I'm just wondering what's going to happen if they don't dip in. I'd just ask out of curiosity if they don't dip in, are they still going to be able to pay the pensions?"

Stuffle: "Mr. Keats, the purpose of this thing is to provide that we will meet the annual pay-out. And in fact, this year because of this Bill in part, we're now being told that the Governor's office will support pension pay-out by the state, the employee's share to meet the pay-out, that is indeed in the budget."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Keats."



Keats: "Mr. Speaker, thanks. You know, I'm in complete agreement with that position and I would hope we will fund out pensions. I'm just worried about if we get another Governor like one we all knew and loved or something like that and we run into that same problem. What's going to happen? Are these pensions going to be paid or not? That's what I'm worried about."

Stuffle: "To be brutally frank in answering your question and I agree completely with your statement, the issue is simply this. That within this system and particularly the state teacher's system, we haven't always met the pay-out. It's possible that we wouldn't still, as you pointed out. But this is a signal to the Governor's office and I hope a signal to us that we're going to meet the pay-out at least."

Keats: "I'll got with you with some trepidation."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 131 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 480, Representative Deuster."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 480. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Abortion Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is a controversial Bill, but at this time, I would like to return it to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of considering two Amendments. I promised my good friend, Representative Kelly, that I would return it. Amendment #4 and Amendment #5, so I request that it be returned to Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, 480 returned to the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Kelly-Walsh. Amends House Bill 480 as amended by deleting in Section 4 the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly. Representative Schneider, I can't see Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, Amendment #4



18.

to House Bill 488, 480 would under Section 4 of the amended Bill take out the last line, the last sentence which says, 'This Section does not apply to any abortion performed as an emergency.'; and replaces it with the wording or sentence that says, 'This Section does not apply to any abortion performed which is necessary for the preservation of the life of the mother.' This Amendment is endorsed by the Illinois Right to Life Society, the Illinois Citizen's Concerned for Life, and I certainly feel and so does Representative Walsh, that this Amendment should be adopted to House Bill 480."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are two Amendments that are being offered. The second Amendment I will be opposing, but this Amendment I do not think is harmful to the Bill or jeopardizes its constitutionality. What the Bill does is to require that with respect to young teenage girls, unmarried minors, that before they are to undergo an abortion operation, they need to secure the, either the consent of their parents or if that's not possible or they're not available, a court order. This is modeled somewhat after the Massachusetts Law. This Amendment that Representative Kelly and Walsh are offering simply changes the exemption language where it says this Section doesn't apply to an emergency. It clarifies an emergency. I think it is a good Amendment and I would... I have no objection to the House adding this to House Bill 480. And I urge your support for the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes. If I'd have known what this one was, I wouldn't have called it."

E. Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just a question I have to the Sponsor. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

E. Barnes: "Would you clarify the language change to defined emergency?"

Kelly: "Well, that's the reason for the Amendment because I am as concerned as Representative was with the word emergency. And that's why I think it should be stricken from this Bill and why we have replaced it with language that says, 'to preserve the life of the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

mother.' I think this is much more understandable and does not need explanation. Emergency is just too broad a term and we're getting it more definite."

E. Barnes: "Well, what you're saying, in effect, is you're not defining the word emergency. You're taking emergency out and putting in the only case that... the only case that it can be carried out. Is that correct? So, in effect, any other kind of emergency and there are many could not, in fact, be instituted with this Amendment added to the law."

Kelly: "That's true."

E. Barnes: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on the Gentleman's motion, the adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Kelly-Walsh. Amends House Bill 840 as amended in the first sentence of the third paragraph and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Amendment #5 to House Bill 480 would strike in Section 4 the words, 'or that the abortion is in the best interest of the pregnant minor for good cause shown.' The reason for this Amendment which Representative Walsh and I feel is necessary is that first of all, what does good cause mean? Once again, we're back to definitions of what is good cause for one person may not be good cause for another. It mentions here that... the best interests of the pregnant minor. How about the aborted child that's been aborted? What about their best interests? Certainly, I know the Illinois Citizen's Concerned for Life, the Illinois Right to Life Society endorsed this Amendment also. In fact, I think it is necessary before I could support the Bill, this Amendment would have to be adopted. And I move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter. Deuster. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would appreciate your attention and the consideration of this Amendment. What this Bill does and I want to sponsor a constitutional



Bill. I'm not interested in an exercise in futility that goes into the courts and is held unconstitutional. And I have been working closely, as closely as possible with the Right to Life people, too, to try and control the problem of abortions with unwed, unmarried young minors. What the Bill does is says that a minor should consult with and get the consent of her parents. If that's not possible, then she gets a court order. This Amendment deals with the subject of what does the Judge consider. The Bill as it has been worked out by the Judiciary Committee provides that a court would approve the abortion if either he finds after a hearing that the pregnant minor fully understands the consequences of an abortion to her and her unborn child and has achieved sufficient maturity to assume full responsibility for her decision. And then comes an or and this is important because the Belotti Case in Massachusetts and a lot of the court language say that you've got to consider the best interests of the minors or if he finds that she's not mature and she doesn't know, that the Judge could find that the abortion is in the best interest of the pregnant minor for good cause shown. I'm afraid that, for example, in a case of a minor that was raped and if the Judge found that she was immature, there's no way if Representative Kelly's Amendment went on and this language went out, that the Judge could approve the abortion. Or another common example is in the case of an immature minor who's impregnated by her father. In the case of incest, there's no way the Judge could approve the abortion. I am interested in restricting abortion, but I want to do it in a constitutional manner. And I think that striking the words, 'the best interest of the pregnant minor for good cause shown' really damages and destroys the Bill. And, of course, I'll respect the will of the House, but I do hope that we'll send over to the Senate a Bill that we can be reasonably assured that it'll be constitutional and will withstand any court assault. And so, I would urge that you oppose Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm sure that this Amendment is well intentioned. But the problem



is that if this Amendment is adopted, the only standard that will be left in the Bill where the court must make a decision of this type is relating to the maturity of the pregnant minor. So that if you have a situation like that, you're going to have those minors who are the youngest, the ten-year-olds, the eleven-year-olds, the twelve-year olds, they're not going to have an abortion, but those who are sixteen, seventeen and eighteen can. Now, that to me in the nature of the world, makes very little sense. It seems to me that you have to have some additional standard in the Bill in cases that Representative Deuster described. And so, I would urge the rejection of this Amendment so that this good Bill can be passed in its original, constitutional and fine form that Representative Deuster put it in. I urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

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

Kelly: "Well, I would just like to renew my request that the Members of this House adopt this Amendment. I certainly think it would strengthen the Bill rather than do anything else. One of my concerns and it was mentioned by the Sponsor of the Bill that Judges in making their decisions, I think we're all well aware that Judges just like doctors, just like individuals, have personal preferences for abortion. If you have Judges that are favorable to abortion, they're going to find lots of good causes to permit abortions. We'll have... the word rape was brought up. I think there'll be an awful lot of cases of rape being reported which were not rape in fact. And therefore, I feel this Amendment should be adopted. I know that all of the pro-life organizations in the state are in support of this Amendment. Without the Amendment, I can't support the Bill and I don't think the pro-life movement can either. And I would ask for your favorable support and vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #5. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Deuster. Simple



majority. Representative Deuster to..."

Deuster: "I think I've spoken in debate although my name was mentioned.

I was going to say with all due respect to the Right to Life movement, they supported a Bill in 1975 that's now unconstitutional and I don't want to do that all over again. I worked closely with their attorney and I would just hope that we would try and have a Bill that'll... I know can work on it in the Senate but I would appreciate some more 'no' votes because I think this gradually destroys the possibility of this Bill being upheld by the courts."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. Representative Kelly. On this question there's 76 'ayes', 28 'no'. The Gentleman's motion, the adoption of Amendment #5, carries. Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you very much. I just wanted to clarify one point that was just raised a minute ago that the abortion law passed in 1975, House Bill 1851, is unconstitutional. At this point, it's still under consideration by the Federal court. It has not..."

Speaker Redmond: "I believe your remarks are out of order. The question was on the adoption of the Amendment and the motion has carried. Any further Amendments? The Gentleman's motion carries, the Amendment's adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 507, Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a simple change from the present law involving the charges on, of interest on all judgments recovered in court. To give you an idea of what we're doing here, the present interest rate that is now being charged on all judgments rendered by a court or jury is 6%. In any case involving, say the award of fifty thousand dollars in a case and the losing party appeals, during the pendency of that appeal, there's a rate of 6%. This Bill changes that rate to 8%. The Judiciary I Committee passed the Bill twenty-two to zero. It has not been changed since 1969. That's when the 6% was changed from 5%. And considering, Mr. Speaker, the marketplace today, the rate of interest of 8% is not out of order. And I would ask for a favorable vote on this Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 508. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the rate of interest and other charges in connection with sale on credit and the lending of money. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "D.L. Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "I have a question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

D. Houlihan: "Representative Bennett, was there an Amendment adopted on this Bill exempting judgments against local units of government?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "No, there wasn't. I understand there was one contemplated at one time that was not presented to the Committee. There was an Amendment to reduce it from ten to 8%."

D. Houlihan: "Would you have an objection to exempting judgments against local units of government? We could take it out of the record at this point, we could talk to you about that."

Bennett: "Sure."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. 557, J. Davis, Representative J. Davis."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 557. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

J. Davis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 557 was called on Third Reading a couple of weeks ago and then taken out of the record after an objection was raised by Representative Dan Houlihan as to the possibility of 557 being redundant. After conferring with Representative Houlihan and staff assistants, the Democratic staff assistant Jim Bagley, the objection was removed as House Bill 557 addresses itself to an increase in penalty in the Criminal Code to a Class A misdemeanor for unlawful entry or criminal trespass to buildings, dwellings, farm and commercial buildings and house trailers. The prosecution provision of criminal trespass of land which raised the objection also used to cover buildings that stood on that land. However, that provision in the criminal trespass to land section only carries a Class C



misdemeanor penalty. And I felt it was not wise to raise to a Class A misdemeanor status the penalty for simple land trespass. Consequently, the Bill is designed to provide a Class A misdemeanor to bridge the gap between breaking and entering and burglary. I commonly refer to this as my Unlawful Entry Bill. It passed the Judiciary II unanimously for which I am quite grateful and I would urge a 'yes' vote on the Bill and will answer any questions that you might have."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan, are you seeking recognition? Houlihan, do you seek recognition? Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative Deuster broke the machine. Representative Barnes. Barnes, Gene."

E. Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

E. Barnes: "Could you tell me, Mr. Sponsor, what the extremes are, the minimum-maximum for a Class A misdemeanor? What is the outside maximum?"

J. Davis: "I don't have the statute in front of me, Representative Barnes, but I believe it's five hundred dollars, up to a year in a jail; a thousand dollars and up to a year in jail."

E. Barnes: "A thousand and up to a year in jail?"

J. Davis: "Yes, sir."

E. Barnes: "Did you say up to or..."

J. Davis: "Up to a year in jail."

E. Barnes: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've had some experience with the present statute on the books and this... the present statute needs this law, this Bill to be passed into law in order to make it more complete because there's no doubt in my mind that if this Bill is passed, there will be a gap closed in a law involving burglaries because this offense would not require proof of intent to steal anything but would amount to breaking and entering and simply being in a place without authority. And I don't think people should be in a place



without authority. So I would like to recommend passage of this very good Bill which cleans up language for the present statutes. I say I've had experience with it because I've had cases to represent people, both as a prosecutor and both as a defendant."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted... The question is... Wait a minute.

I guess we're not ready. You really do the job, Representative Deuster. Representative Cunningham, can you fix this machine? Words broke it. Representative Davis."

J. Davis: "I realize this is pretty heavy legislation, but I didn't mean to break the board."

Speaker Redmond: "It was Representative Deuster that did that."

J. Davis: "Okay. I just wanted to also point out to the Assembly that that one 'no' vote that shows up there is not mine."

Speaker Redmond: "That's a test vote. We don't know whether it was Deuster or Kelly that broke the machine. It was one of them."

J. Davis: "I would accept a voice vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar is recognized with respect to House Bill 1020. This is kind of marking time until we get the machine fixed. Representative Edgar. Representative Edgar is recognized with respect to House Bill 1020 which is on Third Reading. Do you desire to have that returned to the Order of Second Reading, is that correct? Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, 1020 will be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Edgar: "Should have Amendment #2 up there. Do you have it? Okay, Amendment #2 is an Amendment that has been agreed to by the Illinois Association of County Mental Health Authorities who originally sponsored the Bill and the Illinois Association for Retarded Persons who originally opposed this Bill. This compromise worked out would limit the type of grant information that seven or eight boards could require from agencies under their jurisdiction. Appreciate a favorable vote on this."

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

Skinner: "The Gentleman apparently said the magic word. You are limiting what seven or eight boards, the information seven or eight boards



can get?"

Edgar: "Currently, this legislation would allow that, would require that all local agencies under their jurisdiction and that receive funds from them would have to submit all grant applications to them for review. The retardation group opposed this. They said it was too broad. They worked out an agreement that only those type of grants which would deal with, would go into the seven or eight boards long range planning which they've got to submit to the state. So we're not... we're trying to... current law didn't provide for this right now."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, current practice in my county is that every grant has to be approved by the seven or eight board. And I must admit I think this is a good provision. I don't think that our seven or eight board would want any agency which it is providing the majority of financing for to be able to make end runs around projects it might not put in its long-term plan. I'm extremely skeptical about the.... Well, extremely skeptical number one about the Bill because I'm not sure it's needed. And number two, about the Amendment. I scares me to death."

Edgar: "Mr. Speaker, let me take this out of the record and talk to Representative Skinner."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. Representative Satterthwaite with respect to House Bill 684. 684 is now on Third Reading. Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, may I ask permission to take this Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Lady have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted, be returned to the Order of Second Reading."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Levin is the Sponsor of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Levin. Do you have an Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Levin. Amends House Bill 684 as amended in subparagraph 3D and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Levin."



Levin: "Mr. Speaker, thank you, Mr. Speaker. What Amendment simply does is to make clear that House Bill 684 shall include the applicability of the Illinois School Student Records Act. The basic Bill deals with the computer system and there was a concern that the Privacy Act would not be applicable. This makes it clear that the School Records Act is applicable."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved for the adoption of Amendment #3. Representative Satterthwaite, do you desire to discuss Amendment 3?"

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I approve of having this Amendment added to the Bill. In the opinion of the Office of Education, this Act would apply anyway but it just makes it very specific now that confidentiality in school records would still be in the hands of the local School Board."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 675, for which Representative Steele is recognized."

E. Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like permission to take House Bill 675 back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment please."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 675 returned to the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, E.G. Steele. Amends House Bill 675 on page 3 by inserting after line 33 the following and so forth."

E. Steele: "Yes, by agreement with the Committee which passed this Bill, there was some confusion as to whether a backdoor referendum did apply in certain instances. This Amendment helps to clarify that there is a backdoor referendum provided and this is the understanding by which the Committee passed this Bill. And with their approval, suggestions, I offer this Amendment for your approval. Urge a favorable vote."



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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 644, Representative Mudd. Will you please sit down?"

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like permission to take 644 back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted, returned to the Order of Second Reading."

Mudd: "The Amendment..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Mudd. Amends House Bill 644 on page 1 by deleting line 29 and 30 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, this is a technical Amendment which should have been included in the Bill and it's defining working and addresses itself to... with... for grants for school districts with more than five hundred thousand inhabitants. It clarifies the two individual capital assistance programs and puts it in the order that it should be in for consideration. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

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

D. Houlihan: "I wonder if the Sponsor could hold the Bill on Second Reading please? Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Hold it on the Order of Second Reading. The Order of Third Reading, House Bill 544. Representative Murphy. Representative Murphy, 544."

Murphy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill trying to protect a duck clinic in the City of Aurora. Cosponsor of the Bill is William Kempiners and Schoeberlein from my district." Willi

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

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, I arise to make an introduction of a group of



students that of necessity are leaving. They're in the back in the balcony there from Phil Sheridan School, Elementary School, 30th District represented by Representative Collins, Giglio, Dawson and partially by Caldwell and Mann. Glad to have them hear."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this clinic is operated at no cost to any of the patients and we had a malpractice suit run against a doctor in Aurora and the citizens were up in arms about it. He receives no compensation. He is a great idol up there in the City of Aurora. Excuse me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams. Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative Johnson."

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

Speaker Redmond: "We're not ready for the voting machine, I guess. We'll have to hold this one for a while. I'll go back to it. Is there anybody else that has a Bill on Third Reading they want to take back to Second? Representative McClain. What Bill, Mr. McClain?"

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 701."

Speaker Redmond: "701. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 to House Bill 701 which would put back into the Bill that the Road Fund may pay off for bonded indebtedness from that Road Fund. It was inadvertently deleted from this House Bill and all I'm doing is returning that Road Fund monies now can, as they are now, will be placed back into this Bill to pay off bonded indebtedness."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Specifically, what does this Bill do?"

McClain: "Mr. Schlickman, this Bill would prohibit the diversion of Motor Fuel Tax money to agencies and Commissions. This Amendment would provide that... in drafting the Bill, I also deleted that Road Fund monies would be able to pay off bonded indebtedness. That was inadvertent on my part and I wanted to place that back



in so that Road Fund monies could also, as they are now, pay off bonded indebtedness. It's... I've been informed by those that are in knowledge in the bonds that we have to assure our rating and this is one way to assure that rating."

Schlickman: "In other words by this Amendment, that's the only diversion of Road Funds that would be allowed?"

McClain: "No, Sir. It won't effect the municipalities or R.T.A. or townships or counties. They only thing that this Bill would do is prohibit diversion to agencies and Commissions. What this Amendment would do is place back into that Bill that you may also, as you are now doing, may use Road Fund monies to pay off bonded indebtedness."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 701 which has been returned with leave of the House to the Order of Second Reading. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Epton, with respect to House Bill 1489."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1489 itself is one of the major Bills which we'll, of course, discuss fully on Third Reading. It has to do with a guarantee fund covering health and accident and life insurance companies. At the request of Representative Lechowicz, an Amendment has been, is being presented at this time, Amendment #1, which will exclude fraternal. In the past, each year... past four Sessions, the House has passed this Bill with the fraternal excluded. And I should add, with Blue Cross and Blue Shield included. I would move for the adoption of this Amendment which, although I personally am not thrilled with, by the same token, I recognize the legitimacy of their request. And therefore, I ask the approval of the House for this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye',



opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Rigney, with respect to House Bill 827."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 827 provides some additional monies for Ag. extension from state funds. And the Amendment merely phases the dent over a three year period."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Has leave been granted to return this to the Order of Second Reading? It's now on the Order of Second Reading. The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to the House Representative William Walsh, who just arrived."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative William Walsh. I understand he was on exhibit over at the museum all morning. Third Reading. Any other... Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "House Bill 42, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino on House Bill 42."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 42 is accepted as legislation to House Bill 43 which is over in the Senate which is the appropriation for the Mid-Continent Livestock Exposition. What this legislative proposes to do is put the Mid-Continent in with the International Livestock, International Exposition under the agricultural statute. And I ask for your affirmative Roll Call on this legislation. This is a substantive Bill for the appropriation that's already in the Senate at this..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino, are you asking to return this to the Order of Second Reading?"

Mautino: "No, Sir. I thought we were..."



Speaker Redmond: "Well, our problem is that Representative Deuster did something to the machine and we're still waiting on that."

Mautino: "All right, I'll... please remove this from the record at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 802, for which Representative Ted Meyer is recognized."

Meyer: "In which reference to House Bill 802, I have an Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return House Bill 802 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Return it to the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Meyer. Amends House Bill 802 on page 1, line 2 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment puts the legislative salary increase of one dollar a year into the salary increase Bills of the Governor and the other constitutional officers. I move its adoption."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Being the House Sponsor of House Bill 802, I move to table it."

Speaker Redmond: "802 tabled?"

Meyer: "No, 801."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, 801 is tabled. Representative Barnes, are you seeking recognition? No. Representative Bruce Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of an announcement. In the balcony to our left is Carroll Beazey, Executive Director; and Tom Seiger, President and members of the Barrington Area Chamber of Commerce. They are served in District 2 by Representative Friedland, Mugalian, and Stanley. Would you stand please?"



Speaker Redmond: "Is that the Democratic side, Representative Waddell?"

Waddell: "Sorry, but it is."

Speaker Redmond: "Anybody else with a... Let's try 1020 again. Representative Edgar. Representative Deuster, for what purpose are you rising?"

Deuster: "In order to be helpful. It seems to me Representative Kelly's bad Amendment to my Bill caused all this. He's not on the floor. I'd be happy to move to reconsider that, it might fix the machine up."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "...there, Representative Deuster."

Edgar: "I talked with Representative Skinner and Representative Houlihan and I think they understand what the purpose of the Amendment is and I don't know of any objection. Again, I'd like to repeat this is an agreement between the seven or eight board people and the Illinois Association of Retarded Persons."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Amendment on House Bill 1020. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments? Third Reading. Agreed Resolutions. Representative Giorgi."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 210, J. Davis. House Resolution 211, Lucco. And House Resolution 212, Pullen-Porter."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 210, Davis, congratulates Mrs. Mini Freerking on her 98th birthday. House Resolution 211, Lucco, congratulates Mr. and Mrs. Khoren Habeshian on becoming U.S. citizens. 212, Pullen-Porter, congratulates the Modern Music Makers on their 25th anniversary. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motions are adopted. Resolutions are adopted. Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second Day."



Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second Day. House Bill 897. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1248. A Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1050. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to fire protection districts. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1479. A Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would you inform us as to what the Clerk is doing right now?"

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, will you tell him what you're doing."

Clerk O'Brien: "I'm doing Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second Day, page 53 on the Calendar. I've read the first four Bills. House Bills 897, 1050, 1248 and 1479. House Bill 1589. A Bill for an Act to vacate an easement in Kankakee County. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2051. A Bill for an Act to authorize the Department of Conservation to sell certain real property. First Reading... Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2052. A Bill for an Act to authorize the Department of Conservation to convey real property in Kankakee Park District. Second Reading of the Bill."

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

Kane: "Whenever the Clerk gets through, I'd like to be recognized on a Bill to return from Third to Second."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. House Bill 2086. A Bill for an Act to authorize the Capital Development Board to grant sewer easements. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #2 was adopted in Committee. House Bill... That's Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2220. A Bill for an Act to require insurance companies to furnish to fire officials information. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2233. A Bill for an Act to vacate an easement in Menard County. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Did the Clerk read House Bill 1248?"

Clerk O'Brien: "What was the number again?"



Ryan: "1248."

Clerk O'Brien: "Yes, I did."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Third Reading. Representative Kane, is recognized. What's the number of the Bill on Third Reading that you're..."

Kane: "House Bill 809."

Speaker Redmond: "809."

Kane: "Like leave of the House to return it to Second for the purpose of an Amendment."

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

Kane: "Could we adopt the Amendment and move it back to Third?"

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Kane. Amends House Bill 809 on page 1 by deleting line 1 through 4 and so forth."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what this Amendment does is attach another vacation of an easement Bill to House Bill 809. It was a Bill that was passed last year and signed by the Governor. It turned out that there was an erroneous description in the easement. It said eight hundred and twenty-two feet instead of nine hundred and twenty-two feet and this would correct that error. And I would ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries, the Amendment's adopted. Anything further?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 544. Representative Deuster, I'm not going to call on you until the first of July."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 544. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Medical Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Murphy. I think we had, we were on Mr. Murphy to explain his vote. We've had the discussion as I recall. Explain your vote, Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "The Bill parallels the Good Samaritan Act. It is not limited



to the emergency situations. The physician is required not to receive any income from any other business or professional activity connected with medicine. What he does is has this clinic and the poor people are supported by dances that we put on, shows, fashion shows that the people put on in the community, and big banquets. Now if you people want to talk about letting your home town and your counties do your job for you, this is a good way to keep these people off of the rolls of the state. And I'd appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was prepared to speak to this Bill in the Judiciary Committee and somehow I found that the Bill was here on the House floor through the Executive Committee. And I realized that talking to the merits of a Bill that attempts to solve the specific problem of one specific doctor or in a situation that has some degree of sympathy attached to it is not exactly the most popular position to take. But I think it's important that the Members of this House look to see what the precedent value of this particular piece of legislation is. It took our common law in Illinois about a hundred and fifty years to arrive at the place that we arrived at in *Darling vs. Charleston Memorial Hospital* in the 1960's which eliminated the concept of charitable immunity from the Illinois law. In addition to that, I think it's bad precedent value to have a different set of standards with respect to liability for one group as opposed to another. And for those who would say that the thrust of this Bill and the intent and result of this Bill is to help those in free clinics who can least afford it. I think they ought to look and see what the real practical effect of this type of legislation is. And the practical effect is that those people who take advantage of free clinics and I think we should realize that this extends beyond Aurora and beyond Dr. Balthazar to the whole state of Illinois. The ones who can least afford it are the ones who are oftentimes damaged for life, children and otherwise through standard negligence. And I think if we erect this precedent and take this step of giving a different set of standards



to someone who is able to start a free clinic and somehow is not able to afford malpractice insurance, then the list of exceptions and the list barriers that we break down is going to be innumerable and unending, and I think once we take this step, it's a step that we're going to regret in two or three years. And I think that while this one particular case may have a great deal of sympathy attached to it and everybody's going to tell me he's going to shut down the free clinic and people are going to suffer, that more people are going to suffer and all the people of the State of Illinois are going to suffer and our whole common law ethics system is going to suffer if this Bill passes. And I strongly, strongly urge people to look carefully what the real effect of this Bill is and oppose it accordingly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've known this doctor and his family since they came here from Portugal at the turn of the century. This man has given of his all in Aurora. He raised a family of five children and when he got a certain age, his wife and he agreed that whatever monies they had and properties, they would give it to the poor. He, too, was poor when we started. He has given all of one hundred thousand dollars of his own monies to operate this particular project. His home is for sale but he will use all the articles that he and his wife have collected, they are going to sell and he had an open house to let everyone see what there was available. Now, this was the Good Samaritan. Last night I was in the hospital with my wife and I picked up a Bible and I read where St. Luke 19, where there was a Good Samaritan that traveled around Galilee and the River Jordan. He healed the sick and the blind, the lepers and everyone else. Now, this man is doing the same thing. And I think instead of giving money to various organizations where we can have a hundred to a hundred and twenty-five people get free attention. We are contributing to this here, all industry and business is doing likewise, and we're trying to help the Latinos and the blacks in Aurora who come there and don't have anything. One particular case where two lawyers from another city



outside of Aurora came to Aurora and talked a woman into suing the doctor. There was a voice barrier there. She couldn't talk English and they couldn't talk Latin. So, he got them to sign papers, a couple of X's and they represented them, but the jury freed the doctor. Now when things like this are going on, we that live in that town, want to continue this service. And I hope everyone, the man that traveled Galilee and the River Jordan, he wasn't sued. He could continue. He was called upon to help. They sat up in the tree because they were despised. He asked them to come down and he healed them. They entered the River Jordan and were freed of their leprosy. Why can't we do it in Illinois? There are more doctors that should do this. He is not asking for help from Medicare and Medicaid. He's asking our help so he can continue operating. And I hope we can vote for 544. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise to support House Bill 544. One of the previous speakers who was opposed to this Bill stated a argument that is a philosophical argument, and I think there's a philosophical argument the state is supporting this Bill. What we're asking is that the Good Samaritan concept be extended to a physician who performs his services free in a clinic who services are free. What we're trying to say is that a person who is willing to go on the firing line day in and day out and receive no remuneration in a clinic which is supported by voluntary contributions, that this person ought to be exempted from any type of liability other than willful and wanton negligence. And I want to stress that. That this does not exempt him from that type of negligence, just from the run of day type of thing that would occur. Philosophically, what we're saying is the State of Illinois encourages private contributions, encourages private citizens to help their fellow citizens. We do not want to discourage that type of activity. Philosophically, that's what this Bill is saying. And I don't know anybody in this chamber who wants to prohibit a fellow man from helping someone else who is in trouble. And if you feel that way as I do, regardless of whether it's Dr. Balthazar or some other doctor who has left the private practice



and is treating people for free, you'll vote for this Bill just as I'm going to vote for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye'. Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise with reluctance to speak relative to the merits of this Bill. Certainly as a lawyer I might be suspect. On the other hand, we as you all know, do not always vote alike in the legal profession. Everything that one of my, that both of my colleagues have stated about some of the practitioners is certainly true. There are some doctors whose ethics, whose mores, whose desires to help humanity is without measure. The shame, the... it's almost criminal that this splendid doctor, this retired physician from Aurora was forced to expend money to defend himself against a baseless charge. On the other hand, I think that most of us can count on almost one hand the number of not only doctors, but lawyers, farmers, teachers, we can count on one hand the number of great humanitarians that we have existing in the State of Illinois and in this country, if you will. To me, to give immunity to anybody is a dangerous precedent. As a matter of fact, the trend, as you know, has been just the opposite. The trend has been to make everyone responsible for their acts. We have made certain exceptions. But take a situation where you have a doctor who is going ahead and devoting his lifetime to free administration to those in need of his help. His clinic, which can be free clinic, can be sponsored by a nonprofit organization which is reaping only 95 or 98% of its intake by virtue of the cost of operation. Each day, we read in the newspapers of the charitable organizations, of the fine organizations that have had solicitors working for them. Even your Red Cross spends hundreds and thousands of dollars in administrative costs in obtaining free money. What I'm simply trying to say is this. I'm reluctant to speak against giving this immunity; but if I were to ask the lawyers on this floor and the nonlawyers what is willful and wanton, I would get one hundred, seventy-seven different answers. Negligence is negligence. When you take a leg off, whether you do with willful or wanton negligence,



is a question sometimes for the jury, sometimes for the Judge. It's something that even a free practitioner can do. Human error is always present. I, as I say, agree entirely with the comments made by my two colleagues. I sympathize greatly with the need for more humanitarians, but unfortunately, I think I would rather subscribe as I did to a fund to help defend a practitioner rather than grant any immunity to somebody who may be being used him or herself. I think it would be in error for this House to pass this Bill. And I again, for the fourth time, I know it's redundant, I apologize to my colleagues for speaking against it, but I think it would be in error to pass this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Murphy, to close. Murphy."

Murphy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All I can ask for is an 'aye' vote.

I think the Bill is a good Bill and the people in my district subscribe to it wholeheartedly and I'd appreciate a favorable vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Cunningham. Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my 'aye' vote, this is one of those occasions when we lawyers should rise above personal greed. I don't know how it's possible for anyone to be against this Bill, with a due deference to the talented young man from Champaign. But there's one thing that troubles me greatly if the residents of South Aurora are supporting this. And that is that while this man is obviously a near-saint status in that community, how the Illinois State Medical Association could be for it. This is the first time that I know of a Bill that's come before this House, the Medical Association's been right. I wish that all of you could have been in Committee last week when they insisted successfully on a continued monopoly of the right to pierce ears. Now, I just cite that to you as an example of the Medical Association's concern for the well-being of the people of the State of Illinois. Despite the fact that they endorse it, I urge it's a good Bill. You vote for it, too."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the



record. On this question there's 127 'aye' and 14 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. What happened to 557, Representative Davis? 557."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 557. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative J. Davis."

J. Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was out of the chamber when the board came back on. 557 apparently was the Bill that broke the board. I think it's been explained rather well. I don't see any objections being raised and I would simply ask for a favorable Roll Call vote on House Bill 557."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 146 'aye' and no 'nay'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 571."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 571. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 571 establishes procedures for the Department of Public Aid to find some alternative care for people that are going, rather than going into nursing homes. Presently in the State of Illinois, we have around ninety-seven thousand licensed beds for the nursing homes. We have forty-nine thousand public aid patients in the nursing homes in the State of Illinois. It is costing us two hundred and thirty million dollars. And this Bill directs the Department of Public Aid to look into the possibilities of alternative care for people rather than going to nursing homes. And what, they would provide services, day care services, meals on wheels, those type of programs. And I would urge the passage of this Bill."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I'm rising in support of this legislation. I introduced House Bill 571 and I appreciate that Representative Byers and other who worked on a long-term study Committee for planning on introducing similar legislation. I asked



him to take over as Chief Sponsor of this legislation after this Bill was introduced with many Cosponsors in the Assembly. I think it's very important to address ourselves to the institutionalization going on in the sector with senior citizens and handicapped people. The Governor of this State in his State of the State message said that that was one of his first priorities to look at that institutionalization and to talk about alternatives. Well, we have the alternative here before us today and I urge your favorable support of this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "A fiscal note was filed and I'm wondering if you could summarize its contents."

Byers: "Yes, Representative Schlickman, the Department of Public Aid is presently providing the services as mentioned in House Bill 571 under current Title 20. Virtually no fiscal impact from the Department of Public Aid there as noted. Thank you."

Schlickman: "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? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 'aye' and 2 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 584, Representative Rigney."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 584. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "House Bill 584 is a very simple and, I believe, noncontroversial Bill. It was entered for the Illinois Department of Agriculture. It merely removes the division chief of meat, poultry and livestock inspections as a state officer; puts him in the same category as the other four division chiefs in the Department of Agriculture."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on..."



Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Wolf: "I'd like to know when was the last time he got a salary increase?"

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and the Gentleman making the inquiry, there's no pay raise connected with this. This is what the Bill started out to be with the Pay Raise Bill and it was amended in this fashion to take that feature out. I presume that once this change has been made, he will then be paid the same as all other division chiefs within the Department of Agriculture."

Wolf: "I'm a little confused now. You say it's not a Pay Raise Bill anymore?"

Rigney: "It is not a Pay Raise Bill any longer."

Wolf: "But you are increasing the salary?"

Rigney: "No, we are not."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 'aye', 2 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 609. Representative Totten."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 609. A Bill for an Act relating to the election of township officers and amending certain Acts therein. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 609 addresses itself to a problem that we've already addressed ourselves to in this General Assembly in other sections of the state. It makes the Election Code uniform by allowing townships that are contiguous to cities with population over seventy-five thousand, the option of either going to a caucus or to a primary. Now, they are prevented from going to a caucus and this would make it uniform throughout the state. And I'd solicit your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have



all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 128 'aye' and 2 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 594, Representative Schlickman."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 594. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 594 is a simple Bill. It amends the School Code by providing that it shall be the duty of a school board to insure that there is no discrimination on the basis of sex in any district-sponsored sports program with regard to scheduling, staffing or use of equipment and facilities. The Bill is supported by the Parent-Teachers Association, the Illinois Office of Education, the Illinois Education Association, the Illinois Federation of Teachers and the American Civil Liberties Union. The Bill was reported out of Elementary and Secondary Education by a vote of eighteen to one, and I solicit your favorable consideration."

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? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 114 'aye' and 4 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 650, Representative Richmond."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 650. A Bill for an Act in relation to the requirements for competitive bidding in contracts of municipalities and public water districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 650 is rather simple. However, it was drafted, there was one small error in drafting and was corrected by Amendment in Committee. The Bill does include all forms of municipalities and the Bill originally did not. But what it does is to, it raises from fifteen hundred dollars to twenty-five hundred dollars the contract amount beyond which advertising for bids is required in municipalities and in water districts from five hundred to



twenty-five hundred dollars. This Bill was voted out of Cities and Villages unanimously. It is supported and endorsed by the Municipal League. I would ask for your favorable consideration."

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

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Bowman: "How long has the fifteen hundred dollar limit been in effect?"

Richmond: "I'm sorry, I don't know that. In municipalities, it is presently fifteen hundred. It's been, I think, several years and given the increases that we've been confronting, I think this is reasonable."

Bowman: "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? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 105 'aye' and 6 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 601, Representative Yourell."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 601. A Bill for an Act relating to the library media services in elementary and secondary schools. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 601 creates the School Library Media Services Act and establishes an Advisory Committee to work with the Superintendent of Education and the State Board of Education to develop programs for library media services. The Committee consists of twenty-four members; fifteen appointed by the state Superintendent of Education, one appointed by the Speaker of the House, one by the Minority Leader, one by the President of the Senate, one by the Minority Leader of the Senate, and five nonvote ex officio members. All members serve without compensation but may be reimbursed for expenses incurred as Committee members. The same Bill we had in the last Session of the General Assembly but that Bill had a grant and we took the grant out and I ask for your favorable vote."

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



Waddell: "Would the speaker yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Waddell: "Would you tell me what you estimate those expenses to be?"

Yourell: "Representative Totten had a fiscal note on the Bill and I talked to the Office of Education and they said the average cost in a fiscal year would be seven thousand dollars."

Waddell: "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? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 117 'aye' and 8 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 602, Representative Yourell. Representative Macdonald. The Gentleman... Representative Macdonald asks leave to be recorded as voting 'yes'. Does she have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Mautino, same request. 602, Representative Yourell."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 602. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Local Library Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 602 amends the Illinois Local Library Act and the Public Library District Act. It allows the districts and townships in cities of under five hundred thousand to levy an additional tax of 2% for purchasing, constructing, repairing, maintaining and equipping library buildings and sites. The same tax is now levied by cities over five hundred thousand. And we had Amendment #1 to this Bill which placed a referendum on it and we ask for your favorable response."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative John Dunn."

J. Dunn: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

J. Dunn: "Is this a frontdoor referendum?"

Yourell: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing, pardon me."

J. Dunn: "I have one other comment, Mr. Speaker. I would appreciate leaving the switches open a little bit longer for voting. It's



been running a little bit less than ten seconds and I'm not quite that quick-witted to make decisions that fast."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, a Member of the Counties and Townships Committee who heard this Bill, I would rise in opposition to it. I think that this Bill is creating for local taxpayers an obligation which the libraries can go to them and satisfy with a referendum. But because they're afraid to face the voters at the local level, they come down here and ask for authority from us to do these things. I think we should restore the integrity of the local taxpayer and vote 'no' on these Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "I have a question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker, if he'll yield."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

D. Houlihan: "Could you tell us, Representative Yourell, if there's anything in this Bill which poses the restriction on a home rule unit?"

Yourell: "No, there is not."

D. Houlihan: "Thank you."

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

Geo-Karis: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Geo-Karis: "Representative, I don't see any provisions for a referendum in House Amendment #1. Is it in 2?"

Yourell: "On page 4, line 10."

Geo-Karis: "Would you read me the language? I don't have the Bill, Sir."

Yourell: "The corporate authorities may levy an additional tax or two cents of the value of all taxable property in the corporated town, village or townships as equalized so and so forth. Whenever such additional tax is levied by the corporate authorities, any elector in such a corporated town, village or township may file with the corporate authorities a petition signed by electors of incorporated town, village or township."

Geo-Karis: "In other words, if the library district decides to levy a tax and go ahead with the mechanics of it and then if any elector



decides he doesn't like the idea, that's when he can petition for a referendum."

Yourell: "That's right."

Geo-Karis: "In other words, a backdoor referendum. Okay, thank you."

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

Yourell: "Just ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? All voted who wished? Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Explaining my vote, this Bill and the other Bills in the package are endorsed and were given to me by the Illinois Library Association. I know that they want these Bills and I think they deserve them and I would appreciate a few more green lights up there."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this series of Library Bills that were put in by Representative Yourell with the encouragement, I believe, of the Library Commission, were handled in Counties and Townships Committee. In all cases, we put either a frontdoor or a backdoor referendum because we believe that the people should have the right to vote on these things. I think it's the best thing we can do to clear it up so that they might have the opportunity for needed increases and to provide instead of the right to go ahead and levy the tax without referendum, a means to have a referendum. We had the Taxpayers Federation in at the Committee hearings. We had the Illinois Agriculture Association. And I think that the type of referendums that we put on the various Bills would be satisfactory to them, Mr. Speaker, and I would urge a 'yes' vote on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "One thing bothers me about these backdoor referendums and that is you have to go hire a lawyer to be able to circulate a petition. And I wonder if the Sponsor would consider putting an Amendment on here which would require the libraries to have petitions ready so that a citizen could come in if he wanted to oppose



or circulate such a petition and not have to go out and spend fifty to a hundred bucks to get some lawyer to figure out what the proper form is."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Skinner: "Excuse me. Representative Geo-Karis suggests that's not high enough. How about four hundred to five hundred dollars?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Well, I have no objections. The only point I wish to make is that these Bills did receive two hearings in Counties and Townships. They came in first without the referendum and at the suggestion of the Minority Spokesman on the Committee, we did place referendums, both backdoor and a full referendum on some of these Bills. House Bill 603, the next one coming up, does have a full referendum and this backdoor referendum was considered sufficient for this Bill. And I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?"

Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 92 'aye' and 59 'no' and having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 603, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 603 amends the Local Library Act and Illinois Public Library Districts to authorize the Board of Directors of a public library in a municipality or a township and the Board of Trustees of a public library district to create a working cash fund not to exceed five-tenths of the value of taxable... 5% of the taxable property within the corporate or district limits. It empowers the corporate authority, the Board of Trustees to levy annually a tax on a rate of .05 without referendum. Now, we did put the referendum in this Bill. It's a full referendum. It's similar to the same Park District Bill that came out creating last Session a working cash fund and I would ask for your favorable response. The Bill came out of Committee fourteen to one."

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

Skinner: "I wonder if it would be possible for the library district to abolish this fund and then recreate it as the school districts in my area love to do?"



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "I have no idea."

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

D. Houlihan: "Does this Bill impose any limitations upon the powers of a home rule unit?"

Yourell: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 137 'aye' and 9 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 604."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 604. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Local Library Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Yourell."

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

House Bill 604 is a Bill again to amend the Local Library Act and the Illinois Public Library District Act. It changes the mortgage limit on existing library buildings and sites from 50% to 75%. This Bill affects local libraries which are part of municipal or township government and library districts which are special districts formed for the library purposes. Currently, the board of a local library or the trustees of a library district may mortgage an existing library building and site for an amount not exceeding 50% of the value. The money that is borrowed is to be used exclusively for remodeling, repairing or improving of the library or purchasing adjoining sites or purchasing equipment. This mortgaging procedure is usually used instead of issuing bonds for building construction repair. It is supported either by the general library tax or a special tax. Again, this Bill is part of the legislative package of the Illinois Library Association. It came out of Committee unanimously and I would request a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

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



Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Totten: "Does this apply to township libraries?"

Yourell: "It amends the Local Library Act and the Illinois Public Library District Act, so I would assume it does."

Totten: "It does?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster, to the rescue."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, according to our staff analysis on House Bill 604, Buz, this Bill... neither this Bill, nor the original applies to village, town or township libraries, only to local and district libraries, not town or townships."

Yourell: "I stand corrected."

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

D. Houlihan: "No, it does not impose any limitations on the powers of a home rule unit."

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? Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Well, I see this has the required number of votes, but this is as bad as the first Library Bill. And I think that we should all remember when we go home what we've known a lot more than our local taxpayers. And we know how much they spend on libraries and how much taxes they want to pay. And I'm surprised the way we all talk down here that these kind of Bills fly out of here with this kind of a boot."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 107 'aye' and 37 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 605."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 605. A Bill for an Act in relation to library tax rates. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 605 amends the Illinois Local Library Act and the Illinois Public Library District Act. It increases the tax rate corporate authorities may levy for library purposes from .15 to



.20. It increases the rate from .03 to .05 which the corporate authorities may levy above the levy which was approved at an election. This Bill affects local libraries in townships and municipalities under five hundred thousand population and library districts which are special districts formed for library or library purposes. Currently, local libraries and library districts can levy at a rate of up to .15 without referendum. This Bill provides they would be able to levy at a rate up to .20 and we did with Amendment #1 put in the referendum and I ask for your favorable response."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Dan Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "Same question, Buz. Does this Bill have any limitation on the powers of a home rule unit?"

Yourell: "No, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "The Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Pullen: "Mr. Sponsor, is this referendum a backdoor referendum or a frontdoor referendum?"

Yourell: "It's a backdoor referendum but we changed by Amendment with establishing the backdoor referendum instead of ten days, we changed that to thirty days so that they'll have additional time to file."

Pullen: "But it is a backdoor referendum?"

Yourell: "Yes, it is."

Pullen: "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? Have all voted who wished? Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can only repeat what we've said on our... as well as I believe, the first Bill in this Session and this group of Bills. They're all the Library Bills. They were brought to us, to Buz and I, without referendum. We have the wishes of the various organization such as the Taxpayers Federation and the Illinois Agricultural Association,



went into every Bill with some type of a referendum on this. And I think that this gives the voters in the area or district involved the opportunity to voice their wishes. I do not consider it to be taxation without representation. I think it's a fair method for things to be put on and to allow the libraries to continue to operate. I happen to believe in libraries in our rural areas. We don't have a lot of things to go to like you people in the city do and I think we need something like libraries. And I am in full support of anything that encourages reading by our younger people. I would urge your 'yes' vote on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I reluctantly get up to speak against this Bill. It seems to me that what we're doing here is that we've got a Bill that spells out benefits for libraries, municipalities and townships under five hundred thousand. Then we exclude the home rule units, cuts out most of those towns over twenty-five thousand. And what we're really doing is placing in the people in the smallest town where they have the least capability to fight this sort of thing the position where they have to go out and get the big city attorney who's going to cost them an arm and a leg to try to turn off something like this. I think it's putting entirely too much power in the hands of a very few people on the Library Board who, at best, are part time. And no matter how we cut it, for those of you that live in these small towns that are not home rule units, when you go back to your people, you have, in fact, raised their taxes and you've taken their right to vote against this away from them. And when you're trying to explain to them what a backdoor referendum is, you might be counting your votes at the same time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

R. Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Library Bill. It's a good Bill. It provides for a back door referendum and the procedure can only be used one time as I read the Bill. It would allow them a one-time chance to raise their tax rate 5% with a back door referendum and I would urge an 'aye' vote. I certainly think it's a good Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I had a Bill similar to this and it was the agreed on Bill. Now with a backdoor referendum at least you're giving the people a chance. If they don't like the taxation, they can do something about it. When we raised, when the General Assembly raised the levy from twelve to fifteen, they had no chance whatsoever. This Bill originally was to raise, you know, the acceptable levy from fifteen to twenty without the people having a darn thing to say about it. So I think the backdoor referendum is an acceptable way to go. It at least gives the local people the right if they don't agree with the amount of taxation act, they have thirty days to do something about it. And the five hundred and sixty-seven libraries in the State of Illinois are counting on you. As you know, prices have gone up for books. These people need this money if we're going to keep Illinois in the forefront of libraries in the United States and appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I understand this is an agreed Bill but I'm not sure who it's been agreed upon by. My colleague, the Representative from far southern Illinois, was the Chairman of a Subcommittee of the Revenue Committee on which I served during my freshman term, and we must have given the opportunity for every library and Library Board Trustee in the whole state to come to one of our six hearings. Now, we did some interesting investigation of library district tax rates and we found that most of the libraries never ever tried a referendum. They hadn't even lost a referendum and worse than that, most of them weren't even at fifteen cents, let along at twenty cents where they wanted to go without a referendum at that time. So, we said go back and ask for revenue sharing money, go back and hold yourself a referendum and come around again and prove to us that you've really tried to go out and sell something. Don't ask us to take you off the hook, put your lives on the line so to speak. Now, I haven't seen any type of analysis like that from the State Librarian, but I suspect that the analysis would be fairly parallel to the one last time. I'd like to report that in my home town, Crystal Lake, the library people



actually did have the guts enough to hold not one, but two referendums and lo and behold, they passed it. I really think that we take these local districts off the hook too easily sometimes. And I think perhaps this is one of those cases."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, if this passes, I want to be recognized for a verification."

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

Yourell: "Poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's requested a poll of the absentees.

On this question there's... have all voted who wished? On this question there's 89 'aye', 90 'aye' and 65 'no'. The Gentleman's requested a poll of the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jane Barnes, Bartulis, Bluthardt, Collins, Dyer, Ewell, Friedrich, Giglio, Hoffman, Katz, Kornowicz, Kucharski, Madison, Mann, Peggy Smith Martin, McAuliffe, Meyer, Molloy, Stearney, and Von Boeckman."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins. The Gentleman wants to be recorded as voting 'no'. Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Record me as 'aye' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Bartulis 'aye'. Proceed... request has been made for a verification. What is the score now, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "92 'ayes', 66 'nays'."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "May we have people in their seats?"

Speaker Redmond: "Hanahan's rules. Members please be in your own seats. People who are not entitled to the floor, please leave before we'll have the Doorkeeper escort your out. Members please be in their own seats. When the verification... Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson."

Speaker Redmond: "Supposed to stand up and raise your hand according to Hanahan's rules."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych, E.M. Barnes, Bartulis."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes, Telcser, Collins and Miller,



please be in your seats. Wolf, be in your seat. Madigan, Bradley, please be in your seats. Terzich, please be in your seats. You've got to according to Hanahan's rules. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Beatty, Birchler."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler, is he here? He's not in his seat. Representative Dunn, stop interfering with your colleague obeying the rules."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bluthardt, Bowman, Brady, Brandt."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brandt."

Clerk O'Brien: "Breslin, Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Campbell, Capparelli, Catania, Chapman, Christenson, Conti, Cunningham, Corneal Davis, Jack Davis, Dawson, Deuster, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, Ralph Dunn, Epton."

Speaker Redmond: "Jane Barnes, you seek recognition? Record 107 Barnes as voting 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Farley, Flinn, Gaines, Garmisa."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my 'no' vote to 'aye'?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Change him from 'no' to 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Greiman, Hanahan, Hart, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Huff, Huskey, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Kelly, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Mahar, Marovitz, Matejek, Mautino, McAvoy, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, Mudd, Mugalian, Nardulli, Neff, O'Brien, O'Daniel, Pechous, Pierce, Pouncey, Reed, Reilly, Richmond, Sandquist, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schneider, Shumpert, Steczko, Stuffle, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Van Duyne, Vitek, Wall, Wikoff, Willer, Williams, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative James Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, could I be verified. I was in a meeting and..."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Ewing, will you verify James Houlihan? Any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call?"

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Brandt."



Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Ewing: "Brandt."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brandt here? He's in his seat."

Ewing: "Catania."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania here? How's she recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove her from the Roll Call."

Ewing: "Christensen."

Speaker Redmond: "Who? Christensen is here."

Ewing: "Domico."

Speaker Redmond: "Domico is here."

Ewing: "Laurino."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was that?"

Ewing: "He's here. Huff."

Speaker Redmond: "Huff? Representative Huff here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ewing: "Farley."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Farley is in the back there."

Ewing: "Shumpert."

Speaker Redmond: "Shumpert is here."

Ewing: "Holewinski."

Speaker Redmond: "Holewinski is here."

Ewing: "Marovitz."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz? He's here in his seat."

Ewing: "McGrew."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Ewing: "Mautino."

Speaker Redmond: "Mautino is talking to brother Walsh."

Ewing: "O'Brien."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Ewing: "Yourell."



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

Ewing: "I'm looking over the list just one more time."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further?"

Ewing: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Redmond: "Hanahan's here."

Ewing: "Representative Madigan."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Ewing: "Madigan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan? He's over talking to Deuster. Anything further?"

Ewing: "No further questions."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the score, Mr. Clerk? On this question there's 90 'ayes' and 65 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Yourell, while you're standing up, 421."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 421. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning land titles. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

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

House Bill 421 is a product of the Torrens Committee of the Chicago Bar Association and they have recommended that we revise the procedure for examining titles on applications for initial registration. What happened, when the Judicial Review... or the new Judicial Act took effect, it was assigned to the Land Court, seven Judges. Prior to that, they were Magistrates and with the tremendous caseloads in the Circuit Court of Cook County, those Magistrates were made Judges, of course, and then the Judges were assigned to other duties. So that presently we only have one Judge sitting in the Land Court in Cook County. Now what this Bill does, it would provide that the Examiner of titles would be able to process the transmission of titles as they come over from the Court. And we put an Amendment on it so that it does provide for Judicial Review if there's any problem. Now, this Bill came out of Committee sixteen to nothing and I ask your favorable response."

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? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye' and 5 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 623, Representative Byers."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 623. A Bill for an Act to require nursing homes, sheltered care homes and homes for the aged to train certain employees. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 623 is one of the Bills recommended by the Subcommittee on long-term care that was Chaired by former Representative Joe Lundy along with myself who served on the Committee, John Grotberg, Ben Polk was Vicechairman, Representative Holewinski and former Representative Jesse White. This was a series of meetings that we had around the State of Illinois concerned with recommendations and with the nursing home industry and the care of patients. And this is one of our final recommendations, the one that creates the Nursing Home Employees Training Act. We previously passed today House Bill 571 which was the one for alternative care. Presently in the State of Illinois, we have ninety-seven thousand, six hundred and twenty licensed beds for nursing home facilities. The projected expenditure for this year for nursing homes is going to be two hundred and thirty million dollars. And we do have about, a little over half of these people are public aid patients. What the Nursing Home Employees Training Act would do would set standards of training for people that work in nursing homes, for the aids and for the orderlies and people of that nature. In the Lake County reports on the Lake County nursing homes by the Illinois Legislative Commission in the report, they stated that the nurses aids and orderlies are many times the last contact that patients have with anyone that they could relate or trouble their needs to. And having people that are adequately trained to know something about how to deal with older people seems to be only a reasonable step to go. This Bill will take affect July 1, 1980, and for the... right now, the Federal Medicaid program requires this and this would simply



bring the State of Illinois into compliance with these in-service training programs for the nurses aids and orderlies and people that handle old people in nursing homes. I would be glad to answer any questions and ask for a favorable Roll Call on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

J. Dunn: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

J. Dunn: "Who will pay for this training that the nursing homes will have to undertake no later than June 30, 1980?"

Byers: "This will be probably through courses that are approved by the Department of Public Health and it will be with the Department itself. The nursing home people and the people taking the courses will be the ones that will pay for it. No cost to the State of Illinois."

J. Dunn: "And who... As we all know, the nursing homes at the present time are complaining about a lack of funding from the State of Illinois to undertake mandated programs and what position has been taken with regard to the Department of Public Health or anyone else, the State of Illinois to compensate the nursing homes in any fashion for undertaking these programs?"

Byers: "Representative Dunn, presently this year we're going to expend two hundred and thirty million dollars and I... what we're asking here is that people that work with patients in nursing homes where the state is paying that amount of money for over fifty thousand patients that the orderlies and the aids and the people that actually, physically handle these older people that they have some type of skill and knowledge in knowing how to properly take care of those people. And this would require this type of training for those people which, I think, is a very basic human concept."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, Sir, proceed."

J. Dunn: "I would just like to point out to the Members that we've all received criticism back home in other areas about mandated programs that are ordered by, put in by the State of Illinois without corresponding appropriation measures to support them. And while



the, this is not quite the same as the school situation, this is a situation where the State of Illinois will be mandating to nursing homes that they do something than they are now doing which will have a cost factor attached to it. And most of these nursing homes at the present time have a number of patients in them who are supported by the State of Illinois and for which the nursing homes do not receive a full measure of compensation. So this will be putting them more and more in the red instead of helping them. And I wonder if we're really doing a good thing here. I think we ought to think this concept through a little more before we proceed with it."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Byers, you care to close, Sir?"

Byers: "Thank you very much. I would ask that the House pass House Bill 63, 623. I think all of us have copies of the Lake County nursing home report that points out the neglect and abuse of patients in nursing homes. There have been headlines from newspapers around the state one year how nursing homes brutalized patients and this will at no added cost to the state and I think that this is a very basic, human thing that we can do to see to it that people know how to handle these people that work in nursing homes, the older people. And in fact, if they show the love and compassion and care for these people, perhaps some of them will be able to improve enough that they can come out of the nursing homes and actually have a decrease in costs. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 623."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, will this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holewinski, to explain his vote."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would encourage those who are yet not voting to support this legislation. I think it's an important step forward. Our Subcommittee travelled through nursing homes throughout the state last year, noted deficiencies that we attempted to cure by submitting legislation like this. The nursing homes that we visited contrary to some of the comments, are not in the red or near in



the red. This is not going to result in an increased burden. All it's going to do is guarantee at least some minimum level of care, minimum level of training of those who work in nursing homes and who care for the elderly. I think it's an excellent piece of legislation and would encourage all of you to support it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the problems that nursing homes have is the fact that the personnel is not trained too well in handling people who are residents of nursing homes. I think this is a very humanitarian Bill and a necessary Bill because I can envision all sorts of emergencies if the people do not have proper training such as fires and so forth. I urge respectful consideration of this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster, to explain his vote."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, I would have to disagree very strongly with the previous speaker who says nursing home personnel is not well trained. I think nursing home personnel is well trained and I do think that when we mandate more training on some of these nursing homes, we're putting an unbearable burden upon them. And I would suggest 'no' votes rather than more 'yes' votes."

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

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm not totally convinced that training for personnel that are doing such things as emptying bedpans is what's needed. I think you and I could do that without having an expensive training course. The problem with these on-line personnel is more their own psychological makeup than how much training they've had and we cannot legislate kindness. And you cannot train kindness. This is going to cost more money. The fiscal note printed in the Digest says this will have no impact on fiscal year '78 budget. That's because it isn't effective until 1980. But let's look down



the road and you and I both know it's going to have fiscal impact because these homes are going to be spending a great deal of money on this and we're going to be the ones that have to pay the bill. I urge you to change your votes if you are voting 'aye' to 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk, to explain his vote."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, it's apparent some people who are voting on this Bill do not understand what it's all about, especially some of the previous speakers. We went out and toured all these nursing homes and we found unanimity in the nursing homes in saying that they were concerned about safety measures. Not how to empty bedpans, but safety measures in the house. If anyone will actually take the time to look at the specifics and see the people that have died in nursing homes recently, they'll find it's not from fire, not from burns, but from smoke inhalation. And the fire, the State Fire Marshall, the owners of the homes, the county directors that we've talked to, all have indicated if there was some teeth put in it where they had to mandate that their people simply took one hour of training a week on how to get their patients out of the nursing homes, what fire doors were available, how they could best serve and to put blankets, wet blankets over people, simple training for fire precaution. We have no opposition from the people in the county homes and in the Americana homes of those types. They were all supporting this type of legislation and I think it's a Bill that should be passed."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 100 'ayes', 40 'nays', 18 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On Third Reading appears House Bill 184."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 184."

Speaker Bradley: "The reason we're going back to 184, that's where we were when the machine broke down and we're going back and pick that up. We'll get back in order in a minute. 184."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to provide for the designation of



flood plains. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Williams: "Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 184 as amended creates the Flood Plain Management Act and authorizes the D.O.T. to designate flood plains and to regulate within their jurisdiction. Flood plain management is a preventive measure against floods which has been actually shown to be much less expensive and more effectual than remedial measures after the fact, such as channelization and building reservoirs. This Bill will give a clear, explicit statutory authority which has been implied under Chapter 19, paragraph 65(f) in a 1971 Amendment to the Rivers and Streams Act. As we all know, a good government requires that a grant of power to any administrative agency actually be accompanied by a clear, legislative guidance. And the exercise of the powers should be confined within the sound procedures of due process and that would protect all of the citizens against any arbitrary action. Within these limits, the agency should be encouraged to apply its knowledge and experience, technical expertise actually on floods and the avoidance of flood damages. This Bill will insure the continuation of high quality and effective administration by providing clear guidance on the what, why and how of flood plain regulation. I would like to point out the differences in the existing law and what this Bill will do. Actually, the present law provides no state policies on flood plain regulation. It does not even define important terms. House Bill 184 actually gives a clear... a policy statement in Section 2 and precise definitions in Section 3. It also requires adequate notice and hearing prior to designating and regulating any flood plain section in Section 503. The existing law does not require a hearing and yet it makes the report subject to a judicial review under the Administrative Review Act. I'd like to point out that judicial review is awkward because report is ruling-making action while Section 1 of the Administrative Review Act specifically exempts rule-making. Under this Bill, judicial review applies to permit decisions. Actually, this is the purpose and intent of the Administrative Act and the citizens will



be protected against all arbitrary action. I would like to point out that also in the Bill it eliminates any dual permitting by allowing a certified municipality and counties to conduct the program without interference. And further, the Bill provides the necessary exemption procedures to allow for building in conflict with state minimum standards. I would like to point out in conclusion that the Bill will provide a clear and stronger statutory basis to support the state flood plain management program and I request your affirmative vote on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Steele."

E. Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a very important Bill. It's a very far-reaching Bill. It's a very complex Bill and I would urge that if you don't understand it, please don't vote for it because this is going to create a very complex and very complicated set of rules and regulations, a set of maps and charts around the state. It's going to require state building permits in certain parts of this state which are now governed by local authorities. This is another case of big government getting bigger. Now, it's going to affect so-called flood plains, but I want to point out to you very importantly that there are many local areas of this state doing a good job. They have hundred year levees, two hundred year levees that will protect against floods that could occur within once in two hundred years and yes, even with the expense and even with the effort that these local areas have gone to to protect themselves properly, they would be regulated under this Bill so that they'd have to provide building permits given by the state, executed some two hundred miles away from the local area in which the building permits are being sought. Now, this is a far-reaching Bill, very important Bill and I urge that if you don't understand it, you don't vote for it. There are many Federal regulations now governing this kind of situation. And just because there are problems in one area of the state doesn't mean that the people of Knox County or Winnebago County or Madison County or Champaign or whoever else should have to be regulated by state building permits executed some two hundred miles away. I want to point out to you



also if the State of Florida would have had this kind of Bill, there wouldn't be a State of Florida as we know it today. The State of Florida is entirely built upon ground in which there is a water table about two or three feet beneath the ground. If you had this kind of Bill in the State of Florida, that building down there, the progress, the promotions that we have seen take place would not have been experienced and the State of Florida would be in a state of depression rather than a state of growth and progress as we know it today. Very important to the State of Illinois and I say, let's not stifle and hamstring and tie the hands of local authorities where they're doing a good job by imposing upon them a complex set of rules, regulations, maps, state building permits that are not needed. There are plenty of Federal regulations in this area at the present time and I strongly urge a 'no' vote on this Bill. And again I say if you don't understand it, please don't vote for it because it's quite far-reaching and involves the entire State of Illinois."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I reluctantly rise to oppose House Bill 184 because of its good Sponsor and his good intentions. But in our efforts to try to amend out these so-called American bottoms which lies between Alton, Illinois, and Columbia, Illinois, about fifty miles of the Mississippi River Valley. We were not successful because the Department of Transportation, the Waterways Division, was reluctant to amend out by population. Now, I realize they're trying to make this an all-inclusive thing for the entire state, but I want to remind all of you who live in, have any river valleys in your district at all such as the Illinois River, the Rock River, the Mississippi River. All of those places will be discouraged from having any kind of buildings for fear of not being able to expand later on providing some inland screen floods, a tributary to the main river. Now, you have all the one hundred year or two hundred year levees you wish, but if any one of the inland tributaries floods, then this automatically becomes a flood plain subject to the control of the Department of Transportation



Waterways Division. I think we should not discourage industry from building anyplace in Illinois and especially in those places that are hard hit economy wise as the American bottoms is now. We would very much be hurt by any more control than we already have and I join Representative Steele in saying that we should not vote for something we don't know what we're voting for."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hudson, did you wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Bill. I think this Bill is an example of the type of legislation that is difficult in many, many areas but has had a great deal of discussion, a great deal of public hearing and a great deal of thought in Committee. It's a good Bill. It's the product of a lot of discussion. It's a product of many Amendments. And it's the answer, I think, to increased costs in the State of Illinois, particularly in a situation where we have people who are continuing to build in flood plains and then are looking someplace else for support. I think I mentioned the last time I spoke on this Bill situations where we have municipalities in the State of Illinois without flood plain ordinances, who get flooded out periodically and then come to the State of Illinois for five or ten million dollars for support. I think it's been a long time coming. It's one that's particularly important to the suburban Cook County area, one that we've needed for a long time. And in the long run, will benefit us all as far as costs are concerned. I strongly urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Griesheimer: "Representative, I can't see you but I think you're over there. My question deals with the Lake Michigan lake front. As you know, in Lake County particularly in the cities of North Chicago and Waukegan, practically the entire heart of our industrial area is on the lake front which is all landfill, reclaimed land which does even to this day periodically have a tendency to flood during



the period of extremely high water. This last year, the water was actually lapping up against Johnson Motors new billion dollar plant. Now the question I have is that the course of this area was developed over a period of many, many years. I think if we'd have been able to control this many years back, we'd have kept this natural, but somehow industry started there and now that very industry is what makes North Chicago and Waukegan the industrial center that it is. By your Bill, are we going to be in a position where companies such as Johnson Motors, U.S. Steel, Abbott Laboratories and Johns-Manville can no longer build or construct in this area? And how will this Bill react to this type of building and construction?"

Williams: "All right, what this Bill, Representative, does is it... see, in Section 605 and I'm sure that Waukegan, the area up there, are very sophisticated municipalities that now have flood plain regulation equal to the state and they will be designated as a permittee. So they will be allowed to build under the flood plain regulations that your own municipality has. So there will be no, if they are allowed to build under your ordinances now, they will continue to be allowed to build as long as your local ordinance and I'm sure they do, meets the minimum standards of this state Act."

Griesheimer: "Well, will there be a state permit required in addition to a local permit?"

Williams: "No. The dual permitting is not in here at all. You will not need a dual permit. If your county or if your municipality actually has the ordinance, I'm sure they do, then they will not need a state permit."

Griesheimer: "All right, thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook... I'm sorry. Mrs. Martin, the Lady from Winnebago."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

L. Martin: "One of the problems that we've had up in Rockford and Winnebago County area where flooding is no stranger to us is an effort to work out a good flood control ordinance. The total



cooperation, I might add, between city and county and with professional people in the city-county planning is the inability of this department to get cooperation from the state. With the state putting on or demanding the kinds of things that locally don't work and seeming to have very little understanding of the real conditions in Winnebago and Rockford. Now, the compromise that was reached with Amendment #8 do not necessarily make the Bill offensive any longer to Rockford or Winnebago County. But the concern our city-county planning still has is having us stay in this overseer position when our experience seems to indicate they're very difficult to work with."

Williams: "Is that a question?"

L. Martin: "Since you are proposing an ordinance that would put the entire state in this predicament, I'm wondering if you would like to comment on the ability of the state to really understand local problems when local people are trying to truly solve them."

Williams: "Absolutely. That's exactly what this Bill addresses itself to. Under the 65(f), actually Chapter 19, paragraph 65(f) of the state under the rules and regulation, has been doing this by implied authority. What this Bill does, it gives them the explicit authority to do what has really been implied, you know, under the Rivers and Streams Act. It's your municipality and I know you do have with your county ordinance, you have no problem there that this Bill will affect in any way. What this Bill really does, too, is it takes flood plain management away from a township by township basis and it puts it on river basin basis which is really the only way to address flood plain and prevent flooding. So I'm sure your county has no problem with this Bill."

L. Martin: "Mr. Sponsor, our problems are with the state when we've tried to work with them in trying to get our flood plain ordinance. The same people you want to put in charge, we find do not understand the Rock River Valley, do not understand the problems and live in the usual bureaucratic ivory tower, and actually, have stopped good flood plain regulation in our area. Now, this Bill will put those same people in charge."

Williams: "No, if you have good flood plain regulations now that meet



the minimum requirements, then you can continue, your municipality or your county, can continue if they are a permittee and I'm sure they will be because I happen to know that you have good flood plain ordinances there."

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

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, although I have great respect for the Sponsor of this legislation I think this is one of the greatest regulatory power grabs that we've ever had in the State of Illinois. And it's taking the authority away from the people in the State of Illinois, the local people if you please and I think this should be soundly defeated. I'm going to vote 'no', Gene."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Reed."

Reed: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I spoke on House Bill 184 when it was on Second Reading because of the misconceptions. I indicated at that time that all of you had been deluged and you'll excuse the pun, by the flooding problems of your various constituents and you were asked to do something about it. An agency in state government was determined, mandated to come up with a problem that would help solve regional flooding problems in a regional basis. The Division of Water Resources has attempted to do this with this piece of legislation. The Subcommittee met for four weeks and met the complaints, met all of the problems with the various special interest groups and determined that we were, in fact, dealing on a river basin basis where we could best control flooding. I think that if you will read your various staff reports, you will find that that's what this division has come up with. It's not more restrictive, Ladies and Gentleman, in those area where they've recognized their flooding problems. Yes, it is restrictive for the areas who have yet to be flooded and have the potential dangers. I think 184 is a good Bill. It seeks to solve a regional problem on a regional basis. Thank you."

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

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also spoke on this Bill on Second Reading and I want to urge you



to support this House Bill simply because it does standardize and help communities and municipalities who are in real trouble with their flooding problems. This is not restrictive. It is designed to be a help to those municipalities that really are in dire need of the help that they cannot supply for their own areas. This is not a restrictive Bill. It is not a bureaucratic Bill. It has been developed over a very long period of time with careful thoughts and complete cooperation with many of the most seriously flooding areas of Illinois. I urge your support for this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Williams, to close."

Williams: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we have addressed all of the questions that have been presented. This is the result of four Subcommittee hearings and consequently, the do pass motion by the full Committee. I humbly request your affirmative 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Steele, to explain his vote."

E. Steele: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote I'd just like to point out as the discussion has indicated here that this is a wide-sweeping, far-reaching, and a very complicated kind of Bill that's going to affect the entire state. Even though there may be problems in one northern part of the state, it's going to reach into every locality, even where they've taken steps and spent their money and put forward the efforts to properly protect their areas. Now, this might very well affect industry, discourage it from coming in and I say again, if Florida, the State of Florida had this kind of Bill with a water table about four feet under the ground, the State of Florida and the type of progress that has seen there would not be seen today. And so, we need to encourage progress, local government not state government issuing permits for local governments and I encourage a red vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, to explain his



vote."

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

To explain my vote I would just like to remind the Members that the state Department of Transportation does have some authority at the present time in the State of Illinois. And if this legislation does not pass, that authority will not be effective at all. That authority, however, is on a limited township by township basis and as you can imagine, it is very difficult if not impossible to be effective in the matter of flood plain management and flood regulation without state-wide authority. In the event this Bill does pass, there will be uniform, state-wide authority and we will have an opportunity to protect your people back home who want to buy houses in this time period when it's almost prohibitively expensive for us to own single family homes. Can you imagine what you're doing to the voters back home if you do anything which might permit these people who save all their lives to buy this most precious investment only to find out that it's down in a flood plain and their living room is flooded two years after they put the house up. If you vote for this Bill, we have a chance to eliminate this kind of thing. There are enough safeguards in the Bill to protect the investors so that everyone will be in a position of advantage if this Bill passes. If not, no one will."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?"

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Williams, to explain his vote."

Williams: "Yes, I'd like to point out here, this isn't the State of Florida, it's the State of Illinois. And certainly any of the problems that people might think they have in their mind is explicitly explained in Section 6.05 of this Bill that says no department permit under this Act shall be required for construction in a designated flood plain provided that the construction is unlawful without a permit under county or municipal flood plain regulations which is the way it stands now. The flood plain regulations incorporate the department's maps and profiles and floodways which is the way it is now. Administration of the county or municipal flood plain management program conforms to the declared policies of the Act, which incidentally are the declared policies



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

of the national flood insurance program which is another reason for this Bill. It puts the state in a compliance now actually with the Federal government as far as a national flood insurance program is concerned. And it also says that no permit shall be required if the county or municipality has requested and received a certification. Actually the flood plain management program conforms in this section. And I'm sure most of the municipalities and counties do conform to the provisions. I can't understand the reluctance of this. If this Bill doesn't pass, you will not have the local input. Then you will have just the state and not the local government with the input. Actually, a big part of this Bill was the fact that it does put it in the hands of local government. If they have a flood plain regulation, then they will not need a dual permit and they will not need the permit from the state. I would appreciate more 'aye' votes on there. It's hard to understand any reluctance to this Bill when for years, actually the cry down here has been to do something to prevent the flood. Here is your means to do it. Now if we have to go and spend millions of dollars and I mean millions of dollars of state money for construction projects after the fact, then so be it. That doesn't happen to be the way I like to address flood plain management. It should be done here with preventive measures and I would hope that more people would get on there with an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, to explain his vote."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my vote because I think this is a very serious matter. We have worked on this Bill over the last two years and we worked very hard. This Bill had all kinds of hearings in Subcommittee, all Amendments were introduced and most cases was adopted, those that would benefit this area. Here is a man who brought a proposal to us that's trying to help the people in this area with flood plains and we certainly must agree that something has to be done about flood plains in this state. I solicit more support for House Bill 184. There are many of my friends voting 'present' and for no good reason at all and I wish



they would vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in our own district we've had an experience with an area which was flooded out. The people built homes, bought homes on areas of land which was obviously flood plain and they eventually had to walk away with them with only their nose above the water. That cost the State of Illinois millions of dollars. We've gone in with our county forest preserve district, we've bought a lot of the property up. We used state money to do it. That money could better be spent in other areas. And anything that we can do to encourage state and local cooperation relative to flood plain land will do nothing but inure to the benefit not only of the taxpayers of the State of Illinois, but to anyone who would locate a business or a property in that kind of a setting. And therefore, seems to me like this particular Bill is a step in the right direction. It doesn't answer all of the problems, of course, but it does move us in the proper direction. And I would encourage your support for it."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?"

Mr. Conti. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, to explain his vote."

Conti: "I'm voting 'no' up there because I'm not sure, I can't find anyplace in the Bill where it has a compensatory provision in case an area is declared a flood plain. How can anybody recover any of their funds if the state comes in and decides that the south quarter of their forty acres is a flood plain area. And then five or six years later, changes their minds and... Is there any compensatory provision in this Bill at all?"

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished?"

Conti: "I don't hear an answer so I'll have to remain voting 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Jacobs, to explain his vote."

Jacobs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill, the intent might be all right if... in a small stream. But when you live between, as I do, between Rock River on one side,



the Mississippi on the other, there's only a very few square miles that is not really in a flood plain. 1965, we had what they call the hundred year flood. I understand this Bill now is even going above that. We have the John Deere Harvester, the John Deere Company; we have the International Harvester, two of the world's leading farm industries in the world. And they located in a flood plain. I think that we in the... living along the Mississippi and along the Rock River are able to take care of our own problems. There was water in downtown streets of Rock Island and Moline and in East Moline. We're able to take and cope with it. We can build levees and take it out of there. Eventually we will not probably be in a flood plain. But for God's sakes, let us alone now because I think we can handle our own problems without the state interfering. I ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 88 'ayes' and 54 'nays', 17 voting 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Williams."

Williams: "May I have a poll of the absentees, please?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will poll the absentees. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell. For what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Campbell: "I rise to ask for a verification in the event this gets enough votes to pass."

Speaker Bradley: "You're certainly entitled to that, Sir."

Clerk O'Brien: "Beatty, Breslin, Byers, Dyer, Ewell, Gaines, Giglio, Huskey, Katz, Kornowicz, Kucharski, Madison, Mann, Peggy Smith Martin, McGrew, Schisler, Schoeberlein, Von Boeckman."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question, we have 88 'ayes'. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty, arise?"

Beatty: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. On this question there are 89 'ayes' and 54 'nays' and the Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell, has asked for a verification of the Affirmative Roll. The Clerk will call the names of the Affirmative Roll and we will invoke the Hanshan Amendment. Will all Members



be in their seats and would they raise their hands when their name is called? And those people in the center aisle, clear the aisles so Mr. Campbell can see who's here. Call the Affirmative Roll, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych, Beatty, Bennett, Bluthardt, Boucek, Bowman, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Capparelli, Catania, Chapman, Christensen, Daniels, Corneal Davis, Jack Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Epton, Farley, Friedland, Garmisa, Getty, Greiman, Hoffman, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Huff, Jaffe, Johnson, Kane, Kelly, Kempiners, Klosak, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Leverenz, Levin, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, Marovitz, Matejek, McBroom, McCourt, McLendon, Meyer, Miller, Molloy, Mudd, Mugalian, Murphy, Nardulli, O'Brien, Pechous, Pierce, Pouncey, Reed, Robinson, Ryan, Sandquist, Satterthwaite, Schlickman, Schneider, Sevcik, Sharp, Shumpert, Skinner, Stanley, Steczo, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Tipword, Vitek, Walsh, Willer, Williams, Wolf, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "How's the Gentleman recorded, Mr. Clerk? Mr. Gaines."

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

Gaines: "Vote me 'aye' please."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I see I need to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as having voted 'aye'. The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Please record me 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Change my vote from 'present' to 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers."

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

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

Byers: "Record me as 'present'."



Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'present'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Please record me as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Campbell, starting out with 94, Sir. Questions of the Affirmative Roll. The Gentleman from Cook... Pardon me, Mr. Campbell. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Change me to 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. We're at 95 then, Mr. Campbell. Questions of the Affirmative Roll?"

Campbell: "Farley."

Speaker Bradley: "Farley is in his seat."

Campbell: "McBroom."

Speaker Bradley: "McGrew?"

Campbell: "McBroom."

Speaker Bradley: "McBroom? The Gentleman's not in his seat. Is he in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the record."

Campbell: "Beatty."

Speaker Bradley: "Beatty is in his seat."

Campbell: "Bluthardt."

Speaker Bradley: "Bluthardt's in his seat."

Campbell: "Brandt."

Speaker Bradley: "Brandt is in his seat."

Campbell: "Johnson."

Speaker Bradley: "Johnson? He's not in his chair. Is he in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the record."

Campbell: "Chapman."

Speaker Bradley: "She's in her seat."

Campbell: "Dawson."

Speaker Bradley: "Not in his seat, in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"



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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the record."

Campbell: "Greiman. Greiman."

Speaker Bradley: "Greiman is in the rear of your chambers, Sir, on the Republican side."

Campbell: "Huff."

Speaker Bradley: "Huff. Is the Gentleman in his seat back there? I can't see. He's not in his chair. Is he in the chambers? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the record."

Campbell: "Kempiners."

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

Campbell: "Leinenweber."

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

Campbell: "Madigan. I see him. Pierce. Pierce."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in his... he's on the floor. Representative Terzich, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, could I be verified now? I've got to go off the floor."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Campbell, can Mr. Telcser be verified? He's right behind you. Mr. Telcser, fine. Mr. Johnson has returned to the chambers. Put him back on the Roll."

Campbell: "Breslin."

Speaker Bradley: "She's in her seat."

Campbell: "Mudd."

Speaker Bradley: "He's standing behind his chair."

Campbell: "Pouncey."

Speaker Bradley: "In his seat."

Campbell: "Sevcik."

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

Campbell: "That's all I have. Laurino."

Speaker Bradley: "Laurino. He was here. He's not in his chair. Is Mr. Laurino in the chambers? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."



Campbell: "Marovitz."

Speaker Bradley: "Marovitz is not in his... here he is. He just
in the door. Further questions?"

Campbell: "That's all, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Thank you, Sir. On this question we have 91
53 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional
is hereby declared passed. The next noncontroversial Bill
House Bill 199."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 199. A Bill for an Act to amend Section
of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 199 amends Section
164 (a) of the Revenue Act which was adopted in the two previous
Sessions by House Bills 999, both of which were handled by
representative Skinner. House Bill 199 is cosponsored by every
representative in the 9th, 10th and 42nd Legislative Districts. It is
supported by Resolution of all of the taxing bodies in the
area including Prairie State College, Crete Township, District
194 Steger School District, Bloom Township High School District,
the City of Steger, the Village of Park Forest and Madison
District. It seeks to correct an inequity which inadvertently
came about through the passage of Section 164(a). The House Bill
199 would allow an overlapping district where one of the districts
involves, classifies property for taxation to avoid state apportionment
of taxes. The district may do so enacting a Resolution adopted,
in opposition to such apportionment. When Section 164(a) was
there was no provision put in to permit a district to not
their taxes apportioned once it was turned over to the state
do so. The Department of Local Government Affairs is not
to the Bill. They, since it involves duties for them to
of course, take no position. But they're not in opposition.
they've had difficulty carrying out the intentions of Section
164(a). This would, in fact, help them. It will only...
permissive Bill. It only applies if the districts whose
is to be apportioned by the state, if that district feels
inequity is the result, it becomes a political decision."



overlapping tax district and it may, by passing a Resolution, prevent apportionment which means that all taxpayers residing in the district would receive the same tax rate for the levy for that particular district. Again, it's not nonpartisan support from both sides of the aisle by all Legislators in south suburban Cook and Will Counties area. I urge your support."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The Gentleman from Will said it directly. This is a Bill which would indeed correct an inequity that plagues our joint area and I earnestly solicit your support for this corrective legislation. It's fair and it's equitable and we hope you'll vote for it."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 150 'ayes', 151 'ayes' with Mr. Simms, nobody voting 'nay', 3 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 385, Mr. Richmond."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 385. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond."

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

House Bill 385 amends the Municipal Code and provides that any municipality may and upon petition of 10% of the electors, shall submit to the electors of the municipality, the question of whether candidates for commissioner shall no longer be required to run for a specific office. This Bill applies only to the municipalities with the commission form of government. The statutes currently provide in Chapter 24, paragraph 4-319 that a municipality may hold a referendum on whether or not candidates for commissioner shall be required to run for a specific office. But the problem is that if a municipality were to vote to have candidates for commissioner to run for a specific office, there's no statutory way to reverse that decision. This Bill was heard before the Cities and Villages Committee. It is supported by the Municipal League



who consider it a needed change to clear up the situation. This came out with an eighteen to nothing vote. I would ask that, I'd appreciate your support for its passage."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question? Representative Richmond, are you sponsoring this Bill in order to make it uniform to the home rule units which already have this authority so they can be uniform for the other units that are not home rule? Is that correct?"

Richmond: "Well, home rule municipalities could probably take this action under their home rule powers. But additionally the 1970 Constitution provides that a municipality may change its form of government be referendum. However, this statutory change makes the situation clear from a legal standpoint and would thus help avoid the possibility of lawsuits challenging the actions of municipalities in this area."

Geo-Karis: "Could you give me an example of what kind of a change, for example, this Bill would effect?"

Richmond: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you."

Geo-Karis: "Could you give me an example? It's just silly to pass. Give me an example."

Richmond: "All right, I know there are some municipalities down my way that presently their commissioners must run, for instance, for Public Works Commissioner and they'd like to change that and make the designation after... They would not run by title. Now, this is permissive and not, of course, mandatory."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond, to close."

Richmond: "Well, I'd just simply ask for an affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, will this Bill pass? Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 147 'ayes', 1 'nay'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 703, House Bill 703."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 703. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election



Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney."

Rigney: "House Bill 703, I believe, is a noncontroversial Amendment to our Election Code. Two years ago, we passed legislation through the General Assembly that allowed the various municipalities at their option to be able to consolidate their election with the Federal election. However, there was an oversight in this legislation. At that time, we neglected to change the dates for filing and withdrawal of candidates. And that is all that we are doing under House Bill 703."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 154 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 735."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 735. A Bill for an Act in relation to state finance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Sevcik, there seems to be some question about what order the Chair is going in. We're trying to pick some non-controversial Bills so this afternoon we're going to go to 741 and 780."

Sevcik: "Mine's noncontroversial."

Speaker Bradley: "803. We're on your Bill right now, Sir, but Mr. Skinner had a question and that's... then we're going to back and start at the beginning. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sevcik, on House Bill 735."

Sevcik: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is a result of Bob Cronsin, the Auditor General, audit of the Illinois Investigating Commission. The Auditor General recommended that the vouchers go directly to the Comptroller instead of duplicating the process of sending it to the Director of Finance and the Comptroller. So I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. Have



all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 149 'ayes', 3 'nays', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 741, Mr. Mudd. Mr. Mudd in the chambers?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 741. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 741 amends the downstate Firemens Pension Fund of the Illinois Pension Code. Allows pension benefits or payments to be deposited directly in a bank or savings and loan account if requested in writing by the beneficiary. It has an Amendment on it that provides for the bank to be a federally insured in which pension benefits or payments are deposited if requested in writing by the beneficiary. All this does is, enabling legislation to allow pensioners and beneficiaries to receive payments by mail to be placed in their savings account. And I would request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 154 'ayes', 2 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 780, Mr. Pierce."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 780. A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce, on 780."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 780 was introduced at the request of John K. Morris, Chairman of the State Property Tax Appeals Board. He was my seatmate in the Legislature here for many years and served twenty years here. Apparently, when the State Property Tax Appeal Board was part of the Department of Revenue and appeals were taken from the board to the courts, the Appellate would have to have for certifying the record as you do in any administrative review to a court. But when this Department, when this Board became part of the Department of Local Government Affairs, that provision was no



longer in the statutes. All this Bill does and this Bill passed the House two years ago I understand but got lost at the very end in the Senate when it didn't get called. All this Bill does is provide that where the taxpayer appeals from the State Board to the Circuit Court, the record of proceedings, the cost of that certification must be paid for by the appealing taxpayer unless he cannot afford the charges, then the Board will pay. And it's just the same fees you have in other administrative review actions. The Bill was approved in the Revenue Committee and I ask... (inaudible) in passing House Bill 780."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "This is a, definitely an anti-taxpayer Bill. It's a Bill to gouge the small person and to discourage them from appealing assessments past the State Property Tax Appeal Board to court. It really, I know why the Department wants this because the Department will take money for anything but this is really a gouging Bill. I don't even think it says how much, it doesn't even say that the cost shall be at the actual cost of reproduction. And I think that you're going to have to buy more than one copy in order to be certified if the Bill is the same as it was last year when we fortunately defeated it."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 112 'ayes', 27 'nays', 18 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 750."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 750. A Bill for an Act making certain appropriations to the Secretary of State. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House? This is the Redmond-Ryan Bill for the White House Conference



and appropriates a hundred thousand dollars to the Secretary of State for expenses of state activities in preparation for the White House Conference on library and information services in 1978 and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Mr. Speaker, how do you want me to record you up here, Sir? All those in favor shall signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, to explain his vote."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would report that this was one of the more controversial Bills that came before Appropriations I. Those of us who are dedicated to economy wrestled with our conscience for a long, long while. In fact, we had to take two runs at it, but eventually we overcame our conscience and we voted for the Bill. What it provides for is a conference of those who are interested libraries before the White House Conference next year. But the point of it is that the conference isn't those people that go to Washington. Our conclusion was that the finest thing about the Bill were the Sponsors of it, the Leaders of both sides plus Mary Redmond, and that's the reason we all decided to vote 'aye' and why you should vote 'aye' also."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 120 'ayes' 17 'nays', 14 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 770."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 770. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Attorney General. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a deficiency appropriation for the Attorney General in the amount of, the amended amount of five hundred and sixty-three thousand, nine hundred dollars. This is the first time since Attorney General Scott has been in public office that he has asked for a deficiency appropriation. It was brought about by a number of things, but it's important that



it be passed as soon as possible because of some delays that have occurred. The office actually in some of the areas is going to be unable to meet the payroll on May the 15th. One of the reasons that this deficiency is required, of course, is the involvement in the Milwaukee and the U.S. Steel case which involves some two hundred thousand dollars. I'd be glad to itemize this. It has been worked out in Committee. Representative Matijevich, Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, was in on the work with both staffs to... for the Amendments to reduce the appropriation to the absolutely minimum and I would yield to him if he would care to say anything about it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we did wrestle with this in Appropriations I Committee. And after the second appearance in the Committee, the Attorney General did work out an Amendment with it. Someone took my Bill, desk Bill book, but I think it was in an amount about eighty-four thousand, a reduction over what we had in the original Committee. And therefore, because we finally did work out this and the fact that it is a supplemental and we do have to pass this along, I would the Democratic Members to go along and pass favorably on House Bill 770."

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

Hanahan: "Speaker, Members of the House, the reason why I want to speak on this Bill is to bring to the attention of the press, the attention of this Membership of the General Assembly that one of our state officers that so easily goes around the state bandying about his fiscal integrity and his ability to run the office of the Attorney General with hardly a challenge by any person, even a challenge by the electorate, it seems almost foolish, almost foolish that this same Gentleman has to come before the General Assembly with a supplemental appropriation due to poor fiscal control in his office. Now, the facts are that the office of the Attorney General is almost a sacred cow. Nobody dares attack Bill Scott. Nobody dares attack his fiscal integrity. Nobody dare questions his ability to run the office of the State's Attorney



General cause he's such a magnificent fiscal officer. If you look at the history of the last few years of how the appropriation has increased year in, year out and you see the results of what? When officers around the state, county officers around the state wait months for reports of the Attorney General on questions, when city officials wait months for the office to answer a request. And even Members of the General Assembly when requesting answers out of that office, wait months and sometimes years for answers on important interpretations by the office of the Attorney General. I could just say that the press ought to take note and make it noteworthy in their press relations with the various offices of the constitutional officers that in this particular request that what had been told to the General Assembly two years ago and one year ago by this office was not lived up to. Let's look at the request. It says that a 2% transfer among line items was supposed to be complied by January 1st and yet it wasn't. This is what this, why this need for the supplemental has come about. Without legislation input, without following the legislative intent of how a budget is to be expended, this office expended more money in the first six months than legally it was supposed to. Now, is the chief legal officer of the state not following the legal interpretation of how appropriations are to be spent. And I just say to the Members of the General Assembly that somebody ought to stop treating people like they're a sacred cow and start calling it what it is. And that's fiscal irresponsibility and I'm sick and tired of hearing people talking about how they're representing the taxpayers of this state and coming in here for supplemental appropriations that they violated the intent of the Legislature over."

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

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to make a quick comment or two.

If you're assuming that a Republican is standing up to defend Bill Scott, you're kidding yourself. I would like to second much of what Representative Hanahan said, but I want to ask another question. I thought we were on noncontroversial Bills. Didn't this Bill come up before and we didn't pass it, we pulled it off the



record? Isn't that this very same supplemental appropriation? Could we have an answer on that? As I remember, the Attorney General coming over and talking to all of us about it."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Keats, are you through, Sir?"

Keats: "Did we not bring this up before? It lacked the votes to pass, it was pulled off till later."

Speaker Bradley: "It was taken out of the record was all. It's in its proper form. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Did you say take it out of the record?"

Speaker Bradley: "No, Sir. He asked, he was questioning if it had come up before and it did."

Ryan: "Well, let me explain that situation if I may, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "You certainly may, Sir."

Ryan: "Last two Friday nights when there was little press coverage and not many people in the gallery, I inadvertently provided Representative Hanahan an excuse for not calling this Bill. He wanted to postpone it based on a problem that he said he had and wanted to talk to the Attorney General about because I wouldn't call the Redmond-Ryan Bill. And so, I had offered to go back and call the Redmond-Ryan Bill and was told that the votes weren't going to be provided for at any rate. And so, here we are at House Bill 770 and I think that it's in order to call and would certainly hope that we could have a vote on it."

Speaker Bradley: "You're absolutely correct and it's in order. Mr. Keats."

Keats: "That just answers my point that this is supposedly noncontroversial Bills and this one just didn't seem to me being noncontroversial. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm not here to attack Bill Scott or the Attorney General's office but to point out one of the programs in this package. And that's the prosecution assistance program. Some of you may not realize that this was started by the Federal government, one of those programs where they give the state some money and when they get tired of funding it, we have to pick up the burden. In this Bill, there's an appropriation for four hundred and sixty-four thousand



dollars for the prosecution assistance program. And what does that program do? Between June 1st of 1974 and March 1st of 1977, they assisted in the prosecution of two hundred and twenty cases or approximately eighty county cases a year. Now if you figure that their fiscal appropriation that they contemplate is eight hundred and ninety thousand dollars, we find that they are charging the people of the State of Illinois eleven thousand, one hundred and twenty-five collars a case for a trial. A private attorney would handle that same case for five thousand dollars. So what we are doing here is we're paying double for the services of the Attorney General to assist the State's Attorney. Now if we look at the State's Attorneys; they aren't underpaid. DuPage County State's Attorney makes forty-two thousand, five hundred dollars. But the Assistant State's Attorney or the Assistant Attorney General helped with thirty-nine cases in DuPage County; ninety-eight cases in Peoria County and in the Peoria County, they aren't short-staffed. They have plenty of Assistant State's Attorneys. We pay them forty-two thousand, five hundred also. Now, these are the large counties. Now, some of the smaller counties may need this assistance but evidently it's going to Rockford, Peoria, DuPage; the larger counties. Now, I think that what we ought to do is turn this back to the local State's Attorneys, the people that we elect, the people that we can go in and talk to. I don't think the State Attorney General has any business coming in these counties. I'm opposed to that philosophy and I feel as long as this four hundred and sixty-four thousand dollars is in this budget, I'll be voting 'no'. Thank you."

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

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd just like to ask one thing so that the record is clear and what we're voting on is clear to every Member of the House. I'm not here to argue one way or the other concerning the Attorney General and his performance in that office. That's a question that would have to be answered by the public at large. But clearly, clearly, legislative intent and the appropriation... in the current appropriation year and we appropriated from the Appropriations



Committee and concurred in both by the House and the Senate a two and a half percent increase for salaries in the current fiscal year. On August first of 1976, the Attorney General unilaterally by his own decision raised his six hundred and ninety-seven employees five percent. I want to add that. Five percent he increased, August 1st, 1976, after in the year of June of 1976, we here had stated, stated time and time again, that no one, no one would received more than two and a half percent increase in that fiscal year. Now it seems to me very clear about the Sponsor of measures like this, if you are in concert with your thoughts and you feel that it is right and justified to increase beyond the legislative intent of the Appropriation Bill to give those employees a five percent raise after the Legislature has said that only two and a half percent could be increased in that year, if that is the way you feel, I think you should feel that way for everyone. The state employees who have not received commensurate raises in the last three to four years, people on public aid who have not received a cost of living since 1974, people that are talking about fiscal integrity yet and still on the... with the next breath go around the legislative intent of the appropriation in our process to raise salaries over and beyond the amount that we have appropriated for them. Then come back to us to talk about fiscal integrity and belt tightening. The only thing that I have to say about that is whose belt are you tightening. You're tightening other people's, the little people, the people that cannot come here, the people that don't have the clout, the people that cannot walk around this floor and tell each one of us what their desires are, what their needs are; but yet and still, yet and still, one of the top constitutional officers of this state can go around the intent and the purpose of legislation that is worked on and worked out in both bodies of this General Assembly in less than a two-month period and then come back to us for a supplemental appropriation saying, now you okay it, agree with what I did, even though it is what the intent of this legislation purported. It seems to me, it seemed to me that if we're talking a belt-tightening year and we're talking about fiscal integrity, we've got to start right



here at home, right now on this appropriation. And I would advise everyone to vote your conscience. But I would suggest to them, I would suggest to them if you can concur in raising salaries that are not allowed in the appropriation on the one hand and then turn your back on people who have much greater needs or needs just as great that cannot come down here and lobby for it on the other hand and say that that will be inflationary, I don't know what kind of justification that is. And I would suggest to everyone to give deep thought to that when they vote on this supplemental appropriation."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to close."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have to answer some of those things, remarks that were made. Number one, with regard to the State's Attorney assistance program, that's mandated by statute and I'd be glad to give anyone who doesn't, isn't familiar with it a reference. It's certainly in the Act right now where he's obligated to do that. There are a number of cases pending right now where the Attorney General is being real helpful. There's some twenty-six cases varying all the way from kidnapping, murder, embezzlement, misconduct and so on where he's lending his expertise. And where the Attorney General has gone in in those cases, there have been no cases lost. I think the thing I'd like to point out is two things real quickly. Number one, the Attorney General's office is a revenue-producing office. It produces in this state revenue alone some ten times more than it costs. In addition to that, there are, there was some four million dollars recovered for Illinois citizens and there was a million, four hundred thousand dollars worth of nonrevenue-producing activity. And the final thing I'd like to mention, one reason this deficiency is necessary is that the original request was very conservative. And in fact, if you want to check with the states of Ohio, Pennsylvania, and states of that kind, Michigan, states of comparable size, you'll



find that the appropriation for the Attorney General's office in Illinois is the lowest of any of the comparable states. So this is not a big waste of money as has been suggested here. But actually, it provides for the money to provide revenue for the State of Illinois. I think it's a good Bill and it is important that it pass because the funds are running out in some of these departments. I urge your favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and opposed by voting 'no'.

The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword, to explain his vote."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm voting 'no' on this issue and not because I wish to take issue with the Attorney General of this state or with any of the State's Attorneys who have taken advantage of this program. But I regret to say that I think this program is far too inclusive. Now, there are times when some very small counties may have a very serious felony in which there are four or five different defendants and they have to be tried separately and there's only one State's Attorney and maybe an assistant. We've got a hundred and twenty days to get it done in, but they may find themselves in a problem. We do make provision in that case that the county can have some special prosecution. But it also costs the counties very much and I think maybe we should have some kind of a limited program of this kind. But in this day and age when the county is the size that I happen to live in and I think there are many of them you hear who have also been in this same kind of a situation. Was just a few years ago as State's Attorney, I received nine thousand dollars a year and they now are entitled to forty-two thousand, six hundred dollars a year. It appears to me that they ought to be devoting themselves a little more carefully to the prosecution of cases and spending a little more time on them and not calling so easily upon the Attorney General for this aid in prosecution. And it appears to me that at that, that price that they're now being paid, that they can handle most of these things themselves. And so consequently, I'm voting against this supplementary appropriation. I think we ought to have some other kind of a program that is much



smaller and much less available and only on an emergency basis. But I fear that this time, this is just far too much when we've got so many more important places now for us to place our money and when we've made adequate financial assistance available for the State's Attorneys for this state. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from... Mr. Steele, to explain his vote."

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

In explaining my vote and urging more green votes up there, I would just like to point out that this is one branch of government that is a most effective branch of government in fighting against problems in the consumer level and protecting our constituents back home with their constituent problems and prosecuting the violations of those. This is the one branch of government that deserves our support because it's the most active branch of government in enforcing our environmental laws. It's the one branch of government that is protecting our people back home from abuses in the large auto manufacturers. This is a very important branch of government which I think is the most effective we have in protecting consumers, protecting environments, and I really believe that we deserve to give them the green votes and the support that they deserve. More green votes I would urge."

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

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, in the five short years I've been down here, just about every branch of state government has risen at some time or another asking for a deficiency appropriation. Some of the prior speakers who gave the most virile, if that is the proper term, speeches or vehement speeches as the case may be, against this are those same people that argue the loudest for deficiency appropriations of vastly larger amounts of money for their own pet projects and for their own pet areas of government. Now, this vote that's up there right now at best is a political vote. Mr. Scott has been doing an exemplary job in this state. If he happens to be a Republican, but you know as well as I do that you have some Executive Officers that are similarly doing outstanding jobs who might find themselves in the same position. If we're



going to start voting on each issue on a political basis, then I suggest you will not get any of your deficiency appropriations either and this entire state government will come to a screaming halt. I don't think we should allow money to slip through our fingers, but I do think that this is one area of government that deserves honest support because he's brought honesty to government where it wasn't before."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Well, I'd like to explain one more time if this Bill does not pass today, then, of course, you're going to disrupt some very important state services. And part of that service is revenue raising for this State of Illinois where you get back ten dollars for every one you spend. It's the best bargain I know in the state complex. And let me remind you again, this is the first time in Bill Scott's history he ever asked for a deficiency and it's been brought about by some things which were beyond his control. And incidently, I did not rebut the fact he did not give a five percent raise across the board as has been suggested here. And I would like to talk to the one who suggested that after this over to show him that that's true. There were some step increases as has been done by every code department. But I will tell you again if this Bill does not pass today, you take the responsibility for disrupting state services and you take the responsibility for not raising the revenue because that's what the Attorney General's office is, a service office and a revenue office. And I think that some of... there isn't a man in this House that hasn't voted for a deficiency and this is the first time Bill Scott's asked for one. If you want to vote it down, go right ahead and take the responsibility along with it."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 93 'ayes', 16 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 803."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 803. A Bill for an Act to provide for the validity of a lifetime transfer of property with retaining powers



of rights. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This House Bill 803 is a part of the Illinois State Bar Association, Chicago Board Association, joint legislative program. Section 1 of the Bill, it has to do with illusory trusts and provides that any otherwise valid transfer of property in trust or otherwise by a decedent during lifetime, shall not in the absence of an intent to defraud be invalid in whole or in part on the ground that it's illusory because the decedent retained any power or right with respect to the property. It limits the application of a case called Montgomery case to it's... it's application would prevent it from applying to revocable lifetime trusts. The Bill passed out of the Judiciary I Committee fourteen to zero and I would appreciate the support of the House."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 152 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 822."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 822. A Bill for an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 822 is a proposal which would permit municipalities to allow their premises to be used by worthy, nonprofit organizations for the purpose of holding events or fund-raising parties in which alcoholic liquor could be delivered. The proposal does not permit municipalities in any way to sell alcoholic liquor and to, in other words, compete with any alcoholic establishment. I don't know of any strong opposition at all to the legislation. The Illinois Municipal League has approved of the measure and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed



by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? On this question there...

First we'll take the record. On this question there are 110 'ayes', 28 'nays', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 898."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 898. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond."

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

House Bill 898 amends the Municipal Code. It decreases the amount the Department of Revenue may retain for the administration of the municipal use tax from 4% to 2%. Legislation was passed in 1975 to reduce the amount kept by the state for collecting municipal sales tax, the retailers occupation tax and municipal service occupation tax from 4 to 2%. All this Bill does is to include for those municipalities who have chosen to impose a use tax, the service charge from 4% to 2% for its administration. I'd be glad to try to answer any questions."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question... the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Schlickman: "What will be the loss to the state of general revenue?"

Richmond: "Representative Schlickman, I asked this question of the Department of Revenue and I asked the staff to get that information. And the Department responded by saying that it was minimal and almost impossible to identify. And apparently, they have no objections to this because they did not appear in opposition at the hear. I afraid that's the best answer I can give you."

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

Speaker Bradley: "You certainly may, Sir."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, at this time when there's great question as to the amount of revenue that is available to the state, it's certainly not the time to be voting for a Bill that obviously is going to decrease general revenue of this state. Specifically by reducing by 4 to 2% the amount that the



state can retain for the cost of collection on account of the uncertainty of the effect of this Bill, but obviously a reduction in general revenue. I would suggest a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Richmond, you care to close? I'm sorry, Mr. Walsh. Your light was not on, Sir."

Walsh: "No, I know it wasn't. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that you are violating the rules of this afternoon's game which was namely to call Bills that are noncontroversial and that was the excuse that was used by the Chair to take Bills in any order that the Chair chose. Now, I would like on this Bill to stop that practice and go back to the regular call. This is not a noncontroversial Bill. If this Bill were called at a time when perhaps everyone was not here, I think we could beat it. It's not fair for you to call this Bill at this time and I object to it."

Speaker Bradley: "You're entirely within your right and the Chair will go to the order of business, regular order of call. The next Bill to be called would 947. Mr. Walsh, can we continue with this Bill. Are you objecting? You want this Bill out of the record? Mr. Richmond."

Richmond: "In response, this, as he puts it, a very controversial Bill. It passed out of Cities and Villages."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman has the right to object and we'll have to go to the order of call as he wishes. House Bill 947. Representative Hanahan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 947. A Bill for an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 947 is a simple Amendment to the Dram Shop Act that allows a window sign in a window display to be increased in the cost from two hundred and fifty... from a hundred and twenty-five dollars up to five hundred dollars. And it eliminates the size of the sign prohibition that's in the old Dram Shop Act that was instituted in 1933. The reason and the rationalization of doing away with the size of a sign is that it's protected in their local ordinance in all the municipalities and the counties where liquor licenses are sold and allowed to be



issued so that the law in the Federal... oh, wait a second. Mr. Speaker, I forgot. Representative DiPrima had asked me, that's right. I request to put it back on Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment. I'm sorry, he had a Committee Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "You want to put it on... the Gentleman have leave to return the Bill to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment? Hearing no objection, we'll return the Bill to Second Reading for an Amendment. It's been read a second time. Is the Amendment here? This is for Memorial Day. Mr. DiPrima, we don't find the Amendment at the Clerk's desk. Is it Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, DiPrima. Amends House Bill 947 on page 2 by deleting line 6 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. DiPrima, on Amendment #1."

DiPrima: "Yes, I move for the adoption of Amendment #1. All it does is changes the size of the sign that... right?"

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #1. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, on the Amendment."

Conti: "No, not on the Amendment. I'm sorry, on the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "We're on the Amendment now, Mr. Conti. Amendment #1. All in favor... the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. DiPrima, would you yield to a question?"

DiPrima: "No."

Speaker Bradley: "Any other questions, Gene?"

Schlickman: "For the moment, I'd like to hear from the Sponsor of the Bill."

DiPrima: "I'll yield to him."

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

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Amendment is requested by the manufacturers because they are prohibited by Federal law right now from contributing toward the expense of a sign. And they just wanted to keep the same language in the state Act as now presently in the Federal Act. So that's all Amendment #1 does, the Dram Shop Act."



Schlickman: "But, if I may, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Bradley: "Would you like to address the question to Mr. Hanahan?"

Schlickman: "I think so."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hanahan, would you yield? He indicates that he will."

Schlickman: "By the Amendment we are striking the word manufacturer and inserting the word brewer."

Hanahan: "Right, because the manufacturer is prohibited under the Federal Act from contributing to the cost of advertisement of a sign outside of a retail sales. And all this does is bring the state Dram Shop Act into the conformity of the Federal Dram Shop."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Hanahan: "I move its adoption."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #1.

All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. On House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 950. Mr. Hanahan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 950. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Purchasing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 950 amends the Purchasing Act and requires that service contracts in excess of two thousand dollars or two hundred dollars per month under this Act be performed by employees working for rates and under conditions locally prevalent. What the intention of this Act is to not allow the State of Illinois to tear down existing conditions in any community or any locality in the state of an existing prevalent wage, especially in the areas of service contracts such as janitorial and other types of nonbuilding trade type of employment. What has happened in, over the years, in the wisdom of the General Assembly, we have adopted a prevailing wage law that protects our citizens from having its own tax dollars used to tear down existing wage levels in any community with a state contract. The problem with that is it does not extend far enough



into the areas where we may be contributing to a tearing down of local conditions by allowing a state contract to exist that would be granted at lower wages in a community than the private citizens locally are receiving under private contracts. This in no way determines, is determined necessarily by a union wage. It is generally determined by a study of the Department of Labor on an existing wage pattern, especially in small communities around the state. For example, in the Department of Conservation if the existing wage in the community around Antioch, Illinois, for example, for a labor in the Department of Conservation and compare that wage to the existing wage level of a private greenhouse or the private greenhouses around the area and the same kind of work where it's going to be performed by contract. Now, this is private citizens again, not public employees. But private citizens who are going to be employed, that those private citizens would receive wages comparable to all other employees in the area as long as state tax dollars are being contributed towards work performance in the service contract. This Bill is supported by the Service Employees International Union, former Representative Pete Miller has buttonholed a lot of you I know on the Bill. It's a workable solution. We have done this in the printing trade and we've certainly taken care of the building trades in the same exact principle that this Bill espouses and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Leinenweber: "Question for the Sponsor. Was the fiscal note filed?"

Hanahan: "I never received a request for it."

Leinenweber: "Do you know what the fiscal implications would be?"

Hanahan: "None whatsoever that I know of."

Leinenweber: "According to analysis I have, it would raise the general service administrative contracts by 10 to 15% if this Bill was enacted. Is that true or do you dispute that?"

Hanahan: "Well, I mean, any fool could say a dog has five legs. It don't make it a fact. I don't know where you're getting your figures from."

Leinenweber: "You disagree with that then?"

Hanahan: "I disagree, yes, because I believe the State of Illinois right



today is working very close with the business community to insure the fact that they are not going to tear down local existing prevalent wages in any service contracts."

Leinenweber: "Well, if this is being abided by now, why do we need the Bill?"

Hanahan: "To protect ourselves from ourselves in the future."

Leinenweber: "Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I don't know how many of you campaigned on the theme that you would try to hold spending down. I heard the Gentleman who's sponsoring this Bill make remarks very similar to that a few moments ago. This Bill will, of course, add greatly to the cost of the general services administrative which opposes the Bill. It's a bad fiscal measure. It prevents the state from taking advantage of lower contracts in certain areas. I certainly, in this day and age in inflationary times when the State of Illinois is virtually bankrupt, when people like the public aid recipients are asking for additional money, the state employees are asking for additional money, it seems to me very senseless to raise the cost of state government 10 to 15, to pass a law that will raise the cost of state government 10 to 15% in this one area. It makes absolutely no sense whatsoever. I certainly urge a 'no' vote."

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

Willer: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Willer: "Representative Hanahan, does this, would this affect students who work for the state in the summer doing, say, landscaping work or ground keeping, cutting grass, trimming?"

Hanahan: "No. This Bill in no way affects one way or another any state employee's wages. This only affects the contracts that are let out by the Department of General Services that would allow a service contract to exist in any local community. And the Bill only pertains to those employees of a private concern, that those employees aren't being taken advantage of by an unscrupulous employer trying to cut the wages in the locality by using state tax dollars."

Willer: "Well, what if the kids work for the contractor? I'm..."



Hanahan: "You're talking about public employees or private employees?"

Willer: "This affects..."

Hanahan: "You're talking about some college kids working on the college campus?"

Willer: "Well, yeah. I'm thinking of summer jobs, the kids who might work for the contractor doing... with a contract for the state."

Hanahan: "That's fine. I mean, the kids could work all they want as long as they get the wages that are prevalent in the area. The state is not using these kids or as you call it, the young people, to their own disadvantage by exploiting them by having them work for wages less than the existing wage pattern that's established in that community. This is philosophical thing whether or not you want to use the state tax dollars to tear down a prevalent wage."

Willer: "Well, thank you."

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

Telcser: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Telcser: "Representative, I think the heart of this Bill is the prevailing wage rate raise and I'm not quite sure what prevailing wage rates mean. You alluded to it in explanation of the legislation. Why did you chose the Director of the Department of Labor to determine what prevailing wage rates were? Why not let the Director of General Services determine that?"

Hanahan: "Because right today under present law the prevailing wage rate is determined by the Department of Labor. This is the recognized duty under the statutes and that is their work performance that we appropriate our tax dollars for, for them to perform."

Telcser: "But how do they determine if... again, not being deeply involved in labor matters if carpenters..."

Hanahan: "They're already..."

Telcser: "...one carpenter..."

Hanahan: "The carpenters, electricians, plumbers, there's eighteen trades already covered by existing law."

Telcser: "Then who do you have to cover them with this?"

Hanahan: "Because this will not cover them. This will cover a new



group of employees..."

Telcser: "If there are a new group of employees who are working in a general area and... two or three groups in each one has a different wage rate, how are we taxpayers going to be insured that we're going to get the work at the best price instead of at the highest inflated price that'll cost the taxpayers more?"

Hanahan: "If you read the Bill, Sir..."

Telcser: "How is taxpayer protected?"

Hanahan: "Well, if you read the Bill, Sir, you'll find first of all what you're talking about has nothing to do with this Bill. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the prevailing wage of anyone. It is the prevalent working conditions which the Bill calls for in the areas of service contracts which are not covered by prevailing wage. We already have the Davis-Bacon Act and the prevailing wage law of Illinois covering those kinds of employment. What we're talking about specifically in this employment area of contracts are the service employees. Those people who perform janitorial work, those people who perform window-washing service contracts, those people who are not considered skilled, craft trade unionists. Those are the people we're talking about now, giving them the opportunity that their state tax dollars aren't used against them to exploit other people to perform the same work at a lesser prevalent wage. That's all this Bill does and it only affects very miniscule amount of employees, but they need protection just like the carpenter, just like the printer, just like the barber, just like the electrician and every other building tradesman. These types of employees need some protection under law that their conditions aren't torn down. That's all this Bill does."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think the answer to my question which the Gentleman just discussed makes a case for the people who he's trying to protect to go and form their own union. Apparently, they're not members of a union or their union is not doing what they should do for the kind of people in the service work which he describes. This is apparently or obviously, to me, a method by which the legitimate, straight-forward union activity



is being circumvented. The taxpayers of the state are being asked to pay for what might be the higher wages, the higher wages when in fact, in a given area there may be lower wages that are being paid for like kind of work. I submit that that maybe the prevailing wage. I don't know what prevailing means. I don't think the taxpayers are being protected in this piece of legislation. This is simply a way to perhaps organize people in the union activity in a side-wise fashion or through a back door. I don't think that the legislation really hits the nail on the head. I think that union organization and union activities if that's what this is all about ought to be called that. This is a Bill that does something other than what it appears. It's going to cost the taxpayers of this state a great, great deal of money. There's no protection for their interests and for those reasons, I think that the Members of this Assembly ought to vote against this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle. But before Mr. Stuffle enters the debate, the Chair would like to announce the schedule to the Members of the House. We intend to work for another hour until the hour of 5:30. At 5:30, we'll break for an hour and a half. We'll be back in full order at seven o'clock and we will continue to do the business of the state. Now, the Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, to close the debate."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we're talking about a very simple philosophy here. Talking about a concept of trying to make sure that the State of Illinois does not use the tax dollars it raises to exploit its own citizens by tearing down local conditions, especially in service area contracts. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, many times I'm asked and I'm sure some people have asked the question, what is labor's program and... you know, what does labor want out of the Legislature. And I could to those Members that sometimes when you're considering issues



such as this to remind yourself that when the citizens back home elected you and I'm talking about those working men and women back home. And they voted for you to elect you and see that you're in this House, they were talking about issues such as this. They were talking to you, saying to you and pleading with you to listen to the needs of working people so that their conditions of employment are not torn down or taken away from or exploited. But citizen isn't pitted against other citizen for the crumbs of state tax dollars being expended on a state contract. And that's what it's all about. All we're asking for in this Bill is that simply that those workers working under a state contract in the private sector, that those workers are getting the wages that are existing in the private sector in the area that they're performing this service in. And once again I might point out, this does not affect a lot of people. This does not affect a great deal of money. In fact, I don't even know where... the former Representative who spoke on the issue said ten or fifteen percent. I think maybe that acting director who's been in the state about six weeks or so probably doesn't know how to read the Bills any better than some other people, and that he probably doesn't understand what the issue is. The issue here is to protect our citizens from being exploited with their own tax dollars and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. And the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, to explain his vote."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition against this Bill. Frankly, this Bill does nothing more than than destroy the free enterprise system and the competitive bidding that we have that benefits the taxpayers of the State of Illinois. That individual that can come in competitively and bid the lowest price benefits the taxpayers of Illinois. And this legislation very frankly destroys the concept of free enterprise and it's going to cost the taxpayers millions and millions of dollars extra a year in added burdens to the tax rolls. And for these reasons, I vigorously oppose this legislation."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just quickly explaining my vote, this is a good example of the General Assembly being used to negotiate union contracts and I don't think that's a good purpose for a legislative Body to be involved in. And for that reason, I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson, to explain his vote. They want to explain their vote, we have to recognize them. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, to explain his vote. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 59 'ayes', 62 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. House Bill 952, Mr. Hanahan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 952. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Byers, I can't see Mr. Hanahan. 952, Mr. Hanahan."

Clerk O'Brien: "Third Reading of the Bill."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 952 amends the Municipal Code and County Zoning Act and provides that counties and municipalities may enter into contracts authorizing municipalities to control zoning outside their corporate limits. What happened is that in the City of Crystal Lake they were faced with a problem on a watershed project that's outside of their corporate limits and they appealed to the Fitzsimmons and Sargeants gang, the Municipal League and they adopted this type of proposal and I ended up with handling this Bill. It's a Bill that probably at it's worst, won't do too much. But at it's best, will help out in the unique areas when a city happens to have outside of it's corporate limits some provision or some type of project that they need zoning on and in order to insure the bonding of the project, that they just can't go into... enter into a contract with County Board without statutory authority. And this Bill will allow the statutory authority to enter into where there is no disagreement between the county and the local municipality. In our



case in McHenry County, the County Board and the municipality have agreed to, but the bonding company says in order to comply with their wishes, we need to change the statutes to allow this... to allow this kind of contractual relationship between a city and a county on a zoning matter. And I urge a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from... the Lady from Cook, Ms. Willer."

Willer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Willer: "Does this mean that... Mr. Sponsor. Does this mean that a municipality could actually control the zoning laws in an area adjacent to it that's unincorporated?"

Hanahan: "No, ma'am."

Willer: "What does it mean?"

Hanahan: "It says that if a county and a city enter into a voluntary, enter into an agreement on zoning that it then could... the bonding company would feel assured that there would be no problem in issuing the bonds on a project. It's a voluntary agreement of two parties. There's no compulsion or no county over the city or city over the county. The Bill specifically reads a voluntary agreement."

Willer: "Well, what if Cook County entered into an agreement with a municipality..."

Hanahan: "I can't hear you, ma'am."

Willer: "What if Cook County entered into an agreement with a municipality, then the synopsis of the Bill says that if they do enter into this agreement and have a contract then the municipality would have some say over the zoning in the unincorporated part of the county."

Hanahan: "No, the Bill specifically says that the county and a municipality may. If one or the other elects not to agree, there's no agreement."

Willer: "I realize that. I'm just saying what about the people who live in the unincorporated part? Now, maybe the county..."

Hanahan: "Well, the county represents those people and if the county representing those people in the unincorporated area decide to enter into a contractual agreement with the city on a specific



project that it would be allowed under the law and the bonding companies wouldn't have any problem with issuing bonds. That's all this Bill does. It's not a labor Bill, no."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly, I don't know where Tom came up with this good Bill, but it certainly is as good as the last one was bad. I certainly join him in asking for your support."

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

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Schlickman: "What do you mean by to control zoning?"

Hanahan: "Well, what happens in this case, the county can control the zoning right now. If the municipality owns a piece of property outside of their corporate limits and they want to do something with that project, they have to go right now to the county and appeal and apply for that zoning change. Well, this has to continue. Both the county and the city may enter into an agreement though to do that. That's all this Bill does. There is no law right now allowing a municipality to have a project outside of their own corporate limits, there is no law on the statute books according to the Municipal League, allowing them to enter into an agreement. All they want to do is to have this allowance."

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."

Schlickman: "Speaker, Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schlickman, I'm sorry."

Schlickman: "I asked if I could address the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "You certainly may, Sir."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Number one, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill is not well drafted. Zoning... well, you're the Sponsor. Zoning is not an object. It's a means. If you mean to control land use by zoning, that's one thing. But to control zoning suggests that one unit of local government will be able to regulate the exercise of the zoning authority



by another unit of local government. Now, with respect to the substance of it, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I direct your attention to Section 10 of Article XIII of the Illinois State Constitution. And it expressly states, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, units of local government may contract or otherwise associate among themselves with the state, with other states and their units of local government and with the United States to obtain or share services and to exercise, combine or transfer any power or function in any manner not prohibited by law or by ordinance. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is not a well-drafted Bill. Furthermore, in light of Section 10 of Article XIII of the Illinois State Constitution, it is not a necessary Bill. My concern is that it may be mischievous. In all three counts, I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Conti: "Tom, I don't know what Cal Skinner was reading. Maybe he was trying to make amends for the way he voted on your last Bill. I've got a eighteen thousand people in an unincorporated area that are now governed by Cook County. Say Franklin Park or North Lake wants to get in agreement with the County of Cook on what they want zoned in there, those eighteen thousand people in that unincorporated area have no recourse. They have to go along with whatever the municipality and the county... I beg your pardon?"

Hanahan: "Do they have recourse now?"

Conti: "They have recourse to the county only. Now, they have to accept the municipality's request also."

Hanahan: "No, your... calls for them."

Conti: "Well then, your Bill is misinterpreted then, Tom. Maybe if you can take it out of the record, we could sit down and understand this a little better. Right now, the unincorporated area has a bad time with the County of Cook. And now, we're bringing in Franklin Park, we're bringing in Stone Park, we're bringing in North Lake to help decide what's going to happen to that unincorporated area, if the two municipalities agree with eighteen thousand people being completely disenfranchised."

Hanahan: "Really, Representative, that's not what the Bill does. Right



now, those citizens in the unincorporated area have only got the same government that they'll have if this Bill passes into law to appeal to to protect their zoning rights. The same government. I don't take away that power. All this Bill does is allow the municipality, all it does is allow it. They may enter into this contract and I'm not talking about for service now, I'm talking about for zoning - the difference between Representative Schlickman and my idea on that well-written Bill. The contracts here of zoning is what the issue is and it allows the municipality and the county to enter into this agreement for the purposes really of bonding, not nothing else because right now the county... you tell me the times the counties are not going to, you know, grant the zoning at a request of a municipality right now. They do it all the time. We're saying now it should be even further than that and it should be contracted between the municipality and the county. And if both sides agree, then the bonding will not be in question when the project is bonded. That's all this Bill does. I know of only one instance in the whole state that it's being asked for, that's Crystal Lake, Illinois. And this was... this Bill was given to me by the Illinois Municipal League and their attorneys drafted it. They presented it to me on handling it because I happen to be a resident of the 33rd District with Crystal Lake in it. Outside of that, it's not one of my personal labor Bills that I handle around here."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. O'Daniel. The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Waddell: "Other than bonding, Tom, aren't we really saying that the protection of the people in the unincorporated area, though, are protected by the exclusion as it exists now rather than changing it?"

Hanahan: "Well, I think that this is a protection for the people both in the municipality and in the unincorporated area that with two governments in cooperation entering into a contract, the people in both areas will recognize what is going on. Right now, if the



City of Crystal Lake wanted to go to the County Board and get this zoning, who would know about it in the City of Crystal Lake? Nobody. But by having them enter into a contractual relationship, both the city residents and the unincorporated residents of the community would both be very well aware of what's going on."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can understand what Representative Schlickman was driving at. And it's very... it may be possible that the Bill is not necessary because of legislation that Representative Schlickman introduced a couple of Sessions back and I handled for him. But I think really that the legislation is really in the spirit of the Constitution and it permits intergovernmental cooperative agreements. And it's permissive and in fact, if you read the constitutional provision, it says that the state ought to encourage intergovernmental cooperative agreements. And really, that's what this is doing. It's encouraging by legislation intergovernmental cooperation agreements. And I, therefore, think it's a good Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Van Duyne: "Tommy, you insist that the county will have to sign some kind of agreement with the municipality in order to sell these bonds. Now what obligation does the county put itself in as far as putting up it's value of the county in it's full face and..."

Hanahan: "You know, right now, the county has zoning rights. Right now. No matter what we do with this Bill or not, the county has got the power to zone any piece of property where they want. So, we're not going to take away that power. We're just saying that they could enter into an agreement with a municipality. And I might point out, I might have been critical of the Attorney General's budget earlier, but I just talked to Tom Fitzsimons and the reason for the introduction of this Bill is that the Attorney General also concurred that it's a needed change in the law. Now, he's the Attorney General of the state, saying you need a change



of law. I got Fitzsimmons on the other phone, anyone want to call him he's at 2299. The Municipal League debated this issue. They asked me to introduce the Bill. I really don't understand the controversy over a simple Bill like this."

Van Duyn: "The only thing I fear is this. If the county has to sign an agreement with the municipality in order to sell the bonds, then you at least infer that the county has some obligation to the bonds."

Hanahan: "No, the county has no... the bonds have to stand on their own."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor will, of the Gentleman's motion will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. It's the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan, to close the debate."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I expected a lot of debate on workmen's comp. or unemployment comp. or a few other Bills, but on a simple Bill like this where the Attorney General concurs that a change in the law is necessary notwithstanding a better writting of the Bill maybe necessary or may have been necessary in presenting it to me. All I know is that in the City of Crystal Lake, they would like to sell some bonds for a water project and once they enter into an agreement with the county and the county said there is no provision in law to do it, the Attorney General concurred and they said a change in the statute is necessary. The Illinois Municipal League requested this Bill. They debated it and they're the real, true Sponsors behind the intent of this Bill. And in no way do I want to see anyone give up any of it's rights. I was told that it would do, like I mentioned to Representative Waddell, it would protect both the citizens in the incorporated area by letting them be aware of what projects are going on by that city, by that corporate entity in an unincorporated area because in entering into the contract, it would at least be making some local news. And certainly the county citizens



in the unincorporated areas would certainly be further ahead in the game to be aware of a contractual relationship than they would right now reading about it three weeks after the fact in some local newspaper that a zoning change took place someplace. So, I think it's a good Bill. If any other Amendments need to be adopted or offered to it, I think the Bill will sit in the Senate for a month or so. I'm sure that everyone could have input. But in the meantime, I'd like to move it out of the House and I ask for it's, a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian, to explain his vote."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not quite sure how this Bill will work. I have a very basic problem with it and I'd just like to share it with you. I'm a little concerned about the splitting up of governmental authority and power. Let us assume that a municipality is by contract allowed to rezone a large area of unincorporated land. It then by it's zoning determines the traffic patterns, the need for police protection, the need of fire protection. And yet, that municipality will have no responsibility for what it did by it's zoning control over that unincorporated area. It will still be unincorporated and the county will have the responsibility of policing it, of protecting it against fire, considering traffic congestion, not to mention other governmental units that will be affected, such as schools, sanitary districts and so forth. This may be an innocuous Bill, but I think it raises more questions that it solves and I would not be able to vote for it today."

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

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I wish I'd had time to ask a question during the questioning period. But as I understand the provisions of this Bill, it seems that it'd be possible for instance for the county to contract with a city, for instance, such as Freeport to zone all of the area in Stephenson County and put it under their control rather than the control of



the various other communities in the county. I think this is a very dangerous precedent. I think it's poorly drafted legislation. And for that reason, I'm going to be voting 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?"

Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 67 'ayes', 55 'nays', 7 voting 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Well, the Chair would call it, but Mr. Walsh would object. We'd be out of order. On the Calendar, Third Reading, appears House Bill 971. Mr. Taylor."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 971. A Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, will you please take that Bill out of the record please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Out of the record. House Bill 974."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 974. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Doyle."

Doyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 974 is a Bill to amend the Park District Employees' Retirement Board, Employees Articles of the Illinois Pension Code. It clarifies provisions that the discontinuity of the surviving spouse of a deceased annuitant is based on the age of the spouse at the time of an annuitant's retirement. It clarifies provisions that refunds in accrued benefits in the event of the death of the employee or the employee annuitant and the surviving spouse where there's no designated beneficiary shall be paid to the heirs of the employee or the employee annuitant rather than to the heirs of the spouse. Revises the method of funding the revenue requirement from the employer from a fixed tax levy rate to a multiplier form based upon the employee's contribution. This method of financing would place the Park Fund on the same basis as the other Chicago Pension Funds. It came out of Committee ten to zero. This has been approved by the Illinois Public Employees Pension Commission and by the Commissioners of the Chicago Park District.



And I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Everybody on there? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 147 'ayes', no 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 975."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 975."

Speaker Bradley: "Wait a minute, take that out of the record. House Bill 982. For what purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter, arise?"

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, could I be recorded as 'aye' on the last Roll Call with leave of the House?"

Speaker Bradley: "Can he ask consent to be... does the Gentleman have unanimous consent to be recorded as voting 'aye'? Hearing no objection, he will be so recorded. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like unanimous consent to be recorded as 'aye' on 770. It will not change that."

Speaker Bradley: "770. Does the Gentleman have unanimous consent to be recorded as voting 'aye' on House Bill 770? Hearing no objections, he will be so recorded. House Bill 982."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 982. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 982 amends Section 11-406 of the Motor Vehicle Code. This proposed Amendment would increase the amount of property damages required to have occurred to any one person's property from the present one hundred dollars to two hundred and fifty dollars in order for this motor vehicle accident becoming a reporting accident under the provisions 11.406. This legislation was, went through the Motor Vehicle Laws Commission. We had public hearings on it. Also, the Motor Vehicle Laws Committee and it passed without any dissenting votes. I know of no opposition. The State Police were consulting on this as well as Secretary of



State's office. What we're doing here in reporting an accident where nobody's involved but one car, it would not have to be reported immediately as in the past when it's two hundred and fifty dollars. The present law was set up in 1969 for one hundred dollars. But due to inflation and so forth, we feel and many other people feel that the two hundred and fifty dollars is more realistic now. I would appreciate a favorable vote on this issue."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, quickly, if there's anything wrong with this Bill it ought to be more. It ought to be about five hundred dollars. You can get two hundred and fifty dollars damage to a car just by looking at it nowadays. And I think you ought to send it back to Second and amend it and put it up to five hundred."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Neff, do you wish to close?"

Neff: "Thank you. I think maybe the former speaker is somewhat right and if this Bill is passed out of here, I would consider trying to amend that in the Senate to make it five hundred because I think again that's more realistic because a hundred dollars today, all it takes is a scratched fender."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye' and 3 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 983."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 983, Lynn Martin. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Industrial Pollution Control Finance Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Martin."

L. Martin: "Yes, it's seldom a Bill is so easy to Sponsor. This particular Commission gives or bonds pollution control equipment for large and small businesses in Illinois. The bonds are not backed by the state but by the corporation and for small businesses, by the Federal government so there is absolutely..."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion?"

L. Martin: "So there is no problem with the State of Illinois. It also



brings more in fees back than it does cost out. So I would ask your support for this good Appropriation Bill that is good for everyone in the state."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 149 'aye' and 2 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 984."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 984. A Bill for an Act to amend the Board of Higher Education Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman. Representative Ewing, do you want to handle that?"

Ewing: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Representative Greiman asked me to handle the next four Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, Representative Greiman or Ewing. Get you mixed up."

Ewing: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the first of a number of Bills that are presented to bring different agencies of the state government under the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. This Bill is approved by the administration and as far as I know, by the agency. The Administrative Procedure Committee has held hearings at which all of these agencies have been asked to appear and make testimony. Their recommendations for the application of this Act to their agency have been put into the provisions of their Bills. I believe that this is good legislation which can help bring some semblance of balance back into our ruling-making procedure in this state. We all know that much of our lives are governed by the rules that are promulgated by the different agencies and departments of government. I would be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 152 'aye' and 2 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby



declared passed. Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask leave to be added as an 'aye' vote on House Bill 770."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. 985."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 985. A Bill for an Act relating to alcoholic liquors. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Ewing: "Yes, I believe all these Bills are similar in subject matter in their application to the different agencies and I would ask leave to have them all heard on one Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, they will all be heard together. Read the Bills, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 986. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 987. A Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these three Bills do the same thing as the last measure. They just bring different agencies of state government under the Administration Procedure Act and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall these Bills pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 152 'aye' and 2 'nay' and these Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. 990. Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I would question the vote on this last measure with Sponsor Greiman voting 'no'. I'm not sure that he's here in the House and I think maybe the record ought to show that he's not present."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Greiman is here and wanted to be recorded as voting 'aye',



Mr. Speaker. That was entirely a mistake brought about by a long pack."

Speaker Redmond: "990, Representative Tuerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 990. A Bill for an Act in relation to local improvements made by special assessments. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk. Will you please sit down. I can't see Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 990 is a very simply Bill and it really simplifies the procedure for handling of special assessment projects where state property is improved by a local improvement. Right now, whenever state property is involved in a local improvement, it has to come before the Legislature in a special appropriation. There's been some problems with this procedure. What this Bill provides is the state'll be treated just like any other property owner along a local improvement project up to a maximum of twenty-five thousand. Beyond the twenty-five thousand level, it would have to come to the Legislature for special appropriation. I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye' and 2 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 995."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 995. A Bill for an Act in relation to the operation of service stations selling motor fuel. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 995 provides that the owner of a, or operator of a service station that offers both full service and mini-service must provide both services during all hours of operation of the station. There are times when mini-service is offered that a driver pulls into a station and finds that the mini-service islands are closed. Therefore,



being penalized three to four cents per gallon and requiring to get services that he or she does not wish to receive. The Bill does not mandate service stations to offer both full and mini-service but says that if a service station does so offer both, that they must offer both during all hours of operation of the station. The Bill was reported unanimously from the Veteran's Affairs Committee and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Gentleman a question. I think this Bill has a little more to it than what we've been led to think. If they... as I understand it, they offer both mini and full service, they must offer full service whenever they're open?"

Steczo: "They must offer the mini-service whenever they open. Many times you'll pull into a service station, you'll find the full service islands open. However, the mini-service islands are closed."

Leinenweber: "What about, do they have to offer full service?"

Steczo: "Under the Bill, I guess they would have to also, I guess."

Leinenweber: "Well, I think that's... that means that you're going to lose all the savings that the service station may have. At certain times of the day, certain days of the week when they don't want to have people, sufficient employees there to do all the full service activities, I think this is a bad Bill. It's going to cost the service station many of the savings which he would pass on in the form of lower costs to the consumer. I think it's a bad Bill. I don't see why the Bill perhaps couldn't be amended to provide that they have mini-service at all times, but I certainly don't see why we should mandate full service at all time. I think it's a bad Bill and in the present state, it ought to be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't see that a service station is in a position of various state monopolies where we have a right to interfere to the extent that this does in the operation of an individual business. The particular customer or



consumer feels that the particular operation of a service station is not in his best interests and he'd just as soon go to one where they have both in operation simultaneously, I think the marketplace is the best regulator of those things. And I really don't think the state Legislature or any other unit of government has any position in this area telling an individual businessman what he can or can't do with his own business. And I see no reason at all to effect this kind of a restriction on free enterprise and I think it's just absolutely a bad Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies of the House, I remember about ten years ago when I first came to this Body, I had the idea that I was going to come down here and, you know, really burn the place up and burn the people up in the process. Well, after I got down here for a while, I found out most people don't want to be burned up. They just want to be left alone. And this is a good example of the kind of Bill that I might have introduced ten years ago but now recognize that we have no place sticking our nose in other people's business. And therefore, in due deference to the Sponsor who has some good taste in music, I will have to withhold my support of this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Wikoff: "Representative Steczo, what affect will this Bill have on the new Legislative Order by the Governor permitting self-service gas stations? How does this Bill address it?"

Steczko: "This Bill is intended to have no affect. It just says when a person is, sees a sign posted in a service station that offers both services and it only directs it's attention to service stations offering both full and mini-service, then the consumer should be allowed to purchase either service."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bartulis."

Bartulis: "Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for another question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."



Bartulis: "Representative Steczo, who wants this Bill?"

Steczko: "Well, the Bill was directed to me from some constituents and, in fact, I had the same thing happen to me this morning on my way to Springfield. Travelling down the, travelling down I55 seeing mini-service offered at a reduced price, pulled into the gas station only to find out that the mini-service islands were closed and, therefore, had to pay four cents a gallon more for the gasoline."

Bartulis: "Maybe at that time of the morning their people weren't at work yet."

Steczko: "But as long as the service is advertised, then I think the consumer should be allowed to purchase it."

Bartulis: "Well, did they have a closed on their pumps?"

Steczko: "They had the islands blocked so you couldn't pull in."

Bartulis: "All right, that's sufficient."

Steczko: "But the mini-service price at 57.9 was still offered on the sign in front of the gas station which was deceiving to any of the public who were driving by."

Bartulis: "I think it's just a little bit of overregulation and I wish you'd take another look at that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian. Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Can I pull House Bill 995 out of the record to answer all the questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, take it out of the record. 1001. Representative Leverenz."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1001. A Bill for an Act relating to the investigation and prevention of fires. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1001 would enable insurance companies to furnish information regarding fire losses to the investigating agencies such as the State Fire Marshall and local governmental agencies without risk of incurring civil or criminal liability. It came out of Executive Committee twenty-nine to zero. Ask for your favorable vote on this Bill."

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? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'aye', no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1009, Representative Beatty."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1009. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the creation, maintenance, operation and improvement of the Chicago Park District. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill would allow the Chicago Park District to increase the maximum fine that it could levy from two hundred dollars to five hundred dollars. It will give what the park authorities say is necessary for citizens of Chicago using the parks to be more observant of the park district rules. They have been having problems and they also feel that this would be consistent with the recent changes of parental, the Parental Responsibility Law that we've just enlarged on. We've raised it from five hundred to a thousand, but this only goes to five hundred. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 145 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1012."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1012. A Bill for an Act..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz on the floor? Representative Stuffle, I can't see. Is Representative Marovitz there? Take this one out of the record. 1022."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1022. A Bill for an Act regulating the housing of persons by state agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1022 would require that the Illinois Department of Public Health inspect the residential facilities of the State of Illinois. These would include the mental health facilities, the DCFS facilities



and the prison facilities, both adult and juvenile. There were a couple of requests for a fiscal note on Second Reading. The fiscal note provided by the Department of Public Health points out that the total cost when the system is functioning in fiscal 1978, would be forty-one thousand, seven hundred dollars and twenty-one thousand of this has already been requested in the Department of Corrections budget. So for fiscal '78, it would be twenty thousand dollars contrary to what I believe it says in the Republican staff analysis, but this was brought out in Committee. On Second Reading, I added an Amendment requested by the Department of Corrections so that medical services would also be reviewed and reported on. This would assist the administration in making the kinds of reports that are being requested right now in the Federal courts. The Bill is supported by the Department of Public Health, the Department of Corrections, the Illinois Association for Retarded Citizens as well as other citizen's groups for mental health. I ask for your support."

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

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Lady yield? Representative Catania, could you tell me, it says, 'Requires the Department of Public Health to establish health and safety standards.' Did it have any, are there any... is there any muscle to the Bill. I mean, can they close a state facility down or withhold funds or is it just inspection?"

Catania: "After they have concluded their inspection, they report to the Governor and the General Assembly and then it would be up to the General Assembly to take whatever steps were deemed appropriate or the Governor if he chose to do so."

McClain: "Would it give the Governor the power to close a state facility?"

Catania: "It doesn't give specific power, no."

McClain: "So all it is is an inspection and a report?"

Catania: "That's correct so that they would really provide the same service to these facilities that they now provide to private facilities such as mental health facilities, children's facilities. I think most people assume these inspections are now conducted but they aren't in the public sector."



McClain: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "In Section 1, the Bill states that, 'The General Assembly find that there exists within the State of Illinois state-owned and operated facilities for housing persons in the custody of the state which are substandard in one or more important and essential features of safety, cleanliness or sanitation. And that such conditions adversely affect the public health, safety and general welfare.' What is the basis actually of that finding?"

Catania: "Part of the basis, Representative Schlickman, is the finding in Federal court that I referred earlier that we do have these problems right now in our correctional facilities as well as some of our other facilities in Illinois. And that's why the Department of Public Health and the Department of Corrections is supporting this Bill. They feel that they need this kind of inspection so that we can have routine standards established and monitored."

Schlickman: "This Bill applies only to state-owned and operated facilities?"

Catania: "That's correct, Representative Schlickman. They'er enumerated on the fiscal note and I'll be happy to give you a copy if you'd like."

Schlickman: "What is the distinction between owned and operated? Can you give me an example of a state-operated by not state-owned facility?"

Catania: "These are the ones that are state-owned and operated simultaneously. That includes the nine adult correctional centers, the eight mental health zone centers, the state hospitals, as I said, the whole list is right here if you'd like a copy of it."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote... Representative Van Duyne, pardon me."

Van Duyne: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, but I didn't think you saw my light."



Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Van Duynes: "Suzy, will this include Stateville Penitentiary?"

Catania: "Yes, Sir."

Van Duynes: "Could you enlighten me as to what the private facilities, what kind of services and what kind of living quarters, et cetera, et cetera that Stateville Penitentiary would have to come up with to, you know, be reacted favorably with these private institutions?"

Catania: "Well, obviously the correctional facilities are in a different category than the mental health facilities and the children's facilities, Representative Van Duynes. But as I said, the Federal courts are now mandating some of the steps that have to be taken in our state prisons. For instance, they're saying that a certain amount of living space has to be provided and, as you know, Stateville has put a cutoff on their admissions so that they will comply with the Federal court order and they are making minimum provisions for toilet facilities and those kinds of things."

Van Duynes: "Would this mandate single-inmate cells?"

Catania: "No, Representative Van Duynes."

Van Duynes: "One last one. Do you have a fiscal report on this?"

Catania: "Yes. As I said, there is a fiscal note and what it says is that in fiscal year 1978, a total of forty-one thousand, seven hundred dollars would be required for all the inspections of the state-owned and operated facilities. But of that forty-one thousand dollars, twenty-one thousand has already been requested in the Department of Corrections budget so that the total of twenty thousand dollars, that is left in the fiscal..."

Van Duynes: "That would be a minimal cost, though, that few thousand dollars. But what would be the impact of the studies? Would it be in terms of multimillion or maybe even a billion or two?"

Catania: "No, this is the total fiscal note that was provided, Representative Van Duynes. And as I say, the Department of Corrections and the administration is supporting it as is the Department of Public Health so it does have total administration support."

Van Duynes: "Thank you."



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

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I say, this is supported by and requested by the Department of Corrections and the Department of Public Health as well as the Illinois Association for Retarded Citizens. And I would ask for your support."

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

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that when a Bill like this flies out of the House with a vote like that, it indicates that the troops may be too weary to make rational decisions on matters before the Legislature. This is not a harmless Bill. It lacks forty-one thousand, seven hundred dollars of being harmless by one figure. Eighty thousand dollars by the state's figure. It's to require the unnecessary. Bureaucracy run amuck. It's a compound regulation to have one Body of government regulating another. It's an act of futility because the Governor of the State of Illinois is responsible for what happens in his various departments, whether it be the Department of Corrections, Department of Mental Health or whatever other Department that the Department of Public Health is available to go check on. Now, the newspapers will go into those places and inspect them for free and they'll do a much better job than the Department of Public Health could ever do. You can save your taxpayers a small bundle here by reconsidering and voting 'no' for an absolutely unnecessary Bill by any stretch of any one's imagination. It's never wrong to show a little bit of economy and common sense, even though we're all at the public feed trough."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do feel that it is necessary to respond to the Gentleman's remarks. As I said, this is a Bill that is requested by the Department of Corrections and the Department of Public Health. We are now being sued in Federal court, Representative Cunningham, which is costing the taxpayers an inordinate amount of money as I think Governor Thompson pointed out when he spoke at the Republican Conference. We do need this Bill desperately so that the people who are in the custody of our mental



health institutions, our children's institutions, our public health facilities, our state hospitals will be afforded the same protection of Department of Public Health inspections that people in private facilities are now afforded. As I said, I'm sure your constituents assume that when they send their mothers and fathers and grandparents to state facilities, that those facilities are inspected by the Department of Public Health. They are not now so inspected and I think this is a responsible vote, a green vote on this Bill and I would ask for your support. We need 89 votes, Representative Cunningham, and maybe you'd like to recant in public."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?"

Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 98 'aye' and 12 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1026. Is that your first Bill, Representative Catania?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1026. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense..."

Speaker Redmond: "What's your pleasure, Representative Abramson? You want to proceed with this one?"

Abramson: "Take it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. Thank you. 1027."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1028."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1028. A Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriations to the Department of Revenue."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, it was announced that we would recess of 5:30. We're within three minutes. I suggest that we might quit right now."

Speaker Redmond: "The problem is that there's a meeting of the Sudden Infant Death Syndrome and some of our Members will be there and it was suggested that we go a little bit later than the 5:30. Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of an announcement. I would like to state that the Democratic study group will be meeting at



5:30, immediately upon adjournment in the same room, Conference Room 02."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, how about 1028. Did you want to proceed with this one, Representative Skinner?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1028. A Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriations to the Department of Revenue. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Would you please announce what our proposed schedule is, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, we will recess at about 5:30 and come at seven o'clock and we'll try to accommodate everybody at seven o'clock. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, for starters, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have permission to be voted 'yes' on House Bills 985, 986 and 987."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave?"

Skinner: "For seconders, House Bill 1088 makes the annual deficiency appropriation to the Department of Revenue so that our constituents can get their income tax refunds. In addition, there is... in addition to that ten million dollars, there's fifteen million dollars that will provide for more senior citizen property tax relief grants. There is absolutely no money left in that latter fund. I would respectfully ask for your support of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "What, a question of Representative Skinner. Did he ask for leave to take three Bills together? Did I understand that right?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, he asked leave to be recorded on three Bills that he was..."

Skinner: "...the bathroom."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further, any discussion on this Bill? 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? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. We



got time for 1035. Representative Edgar."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1035. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Civil Service Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the annual appropriation for the Civil Service Commission, two hundred and forty-four thousand dollars, two hundred forty-four thousand, two hundred dollars opposed to last year two hundred and forty-one thousand, five hundred dollars. Appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is... Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Lechowicz: "What's the ten thousand increase over fiscal '77?"

Edgar: "It's not ten thousand."

Lechowicz: "Nine thousand, nine hundred."

Edgar: "It's four thousand dollars increase. It's been amended down from Committee. Basically, it's for the usual increase for step increases and employees and some increases of... for office space. Four thousand was amended out in Committee."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further 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? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 'aye' and 2 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Madigan, for the purpose of a motion. Oh, wait a minute. Consent Calendar. Pardon me, before we go to Madigan. Consent Calendar, Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day. House Bill 1086. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1294. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill. 1294 is stricken. House Bill 1298. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1306. 1306 is stricken



off the Consent Calendar. House Bill 1706. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1751. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Antitrust Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1858. A Bill for an Act to amend the Court Reporters Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 1874 is stricken from the Consent Calendar. House Bill 2042. A Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2053. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2130. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2229. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2262. A Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan. Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to be recorded as voting 'aye' on House Bill 983."

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

Adams: "I'd like to have leave to be voted 'aye' on 1028."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Madigan. The question is, shall these Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Geo-Karis: "I'd like to be voted..."

Speaker Redmond: "One thing at a time now."

Geo-Karis: "May I vote 'yes' on all but 1874? Because I don't know too much about it, that's why."

Clerk O'Brien: "That Bill is stricken from the Consent Calendar."

Geo-Karis: "Okay, I'm all set now."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On these... Bills... these Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. 126 'aye' and no 'nay'. Declared passed. Representative Madigan, for a motion."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we recess until seven o'clock, subject



to the program of the Clerk."

Speaker Redmond: "What's your program, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Two minute perfunctory to introduce Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll recess until seven o'clock at which time we intend to call Lifeline, E.R.A., Laetrile, Coastline, Workmen's Compensation, Unemployment Comp. and Minimum Wage. Seven o'clock. The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Seven o'clock."

Clerk O'Brien: "Introduction and First Reading. House Bill 2381, Bradley. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Secretary of State. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2382, Pierce. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2383, Giorgi-Manahan. A Bill for an Act to provide for negotiated waged increases. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2384, Kent. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Registration and Education. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2385, Terzich. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Illinois Law Revision Commission. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2386, Cunningham. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Finance. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 308. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Commission to visit and examine state institutions. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 639. A Bill for an Act to authorize the Department of Transportation to make and execute agreements. First Reading of the Bill. No further business, the House now stands in recess..."



Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading. House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 1036. Representative Robinson, do you want to call House Bill 1036? Out of the record. 1072, Representative Ebbesen. I think we had that one once before and it...ran into trouble from 'Digger' Simms. 1094, Representative Beatty. Out of the record. 1101, Representative Leverenz. Representative Leverenz...he's not in the chamber. Out of the record. 1111, Representative Skinner."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1111, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I'm willing to be a guinea pig one time, but not twice."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you desire that on Postponed Consideration, I assume?"

Skinner: "I think...I think it's such a great Bill that that probably wouldn't make a difference in its passage chances; but I'd prefer that you just take it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. 1187. Representative Jaffe on the floor? Do you see Representative Jaffe? That's not Jaffe, that's Hanahan. He thought you were Jaffe. Representative Bradley. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if we go through these Bills in the list...in the way you're calling them right now, and we pass up some of the Bills that Members have sponsored who are not in the chambers, if we go all the way through the list and complete the Third Reading, what...the next Bill to be called then, would we start all over again at the beginning of the Calendar because I'm sure that some of the Members...I'm looking down here at...Representative Epton has three Bills regarding the Insurance Code, and I'm...they're noncontroversial Bills. If we pass those Bills at this time while we're waiting for all the Members to get here...well, if we take those out of the record, then we will be back in the posture we start all over again on Third Readings, and what I'm attempting to do here is delay a little time until the Members get here. Because I think that if we pass these up, it may be a long time before we get back to give these Members a chance to call their Bill."



And I'm wondering...so my question I ask is if we go all the way through to Third Reading, are we going to start all over again with the first Bill on Third Reading, which would be...which would be fine? And I know that the hour is 7:10...is here and Members should be here; but I assume then we will go back and start all over again if we get down through the last Bill on Third Reading is 2282, then we would start all over again at the beginning of the list on Third Reading. Is that correct, Sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "I...it's a little bit difficult to answer that. My idea is that every Member should be given an opportunity to have his Bill called; and I don't think that we should be going back over, and over and over again for the same Bills. I think we should..."

Bradley: "Right, I certainly concur in that...but it's...I recall two years ago we had such a long list of Bills on Third Reading if you ...you really couldn't afford to let a...let your turn go by without calling the Bill. And I feel that might be the situation here very briefly or very quickly. If they let these Bills go by them, some of them are important Bills, we may never get back to them again in the next three weeks. And I would certainly...I guess what I'm saying to you, Mr. Speaker, not so much to you, Sir, but to the Members of the House who have Bills on Third Reading, I would certainly urge them to get here as promptly and as quickly as possible because some of these Bills I would like to support. And if they're not here to inter...to explain the Bill, we simply will not be in a position that we can vote for them. So if they're within the sound of my voice, I would urge them to get over here so we proceed with the business at hand, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "I think that's a pretty good point. Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I knew that our microphones were plugged into our office. Are they also plugged into the Forum Thirty?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I would just like to remind everybody that we had it made the 23rd two years ago, and that bewitching hour, the gavel fell; and the gavel is going to fall on May the 21st. So I would



suggest the buddy system. You know, like when you go scuba diving you don't go alone. Be sure that you get your friends here.

Representative Mahar, former Mayor of Homewood."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you remember, the people who are here, ready to take care of the business of the House and some of these Bills have to be called later on. I think some of us are interested in getting our Bills called. And because of the numbers, situation and so forth, we might get passed over; but we're here to do the job. And some time later on I hope that we get some consideration when we asked to have our Bills called."

Speaker Redmond: "I wonder if it would be in order to take an unofficial Roll Call now that I will keep in the drawer here? And then...then when the time comes to call Bills, why we'll have priority of call for the Members who've been in attendance. How about that? Okay. Roll Call for attendance. This is a...this is a favored list. Is Everybody...just get on here, this is a...we're going to have a priority of call on the basis of the Members who are here ready to do business. Everybody on that's in the chamber? Okay. Mahar's here. Okay, take the record, Mr. Clerk, and will you give me that printout? That doesn't go into the Journal. That's just for our own secret use here. Representative Polk. Do you want to pray? Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "I suggest we go in alphabetical order off that list, too, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "'Zick'. You missed out, Mr. Mudd. Does Representative Mudd have leave to get on this list? Okay. Okay, you'll be added to the end of the list. Representative Byers. Byers.

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, I noticed a little problem we've got with our board up here. We have one Representative's name that's spelled one way on this board and it's spelled a different way on this board. And I'm running a prize for anyone that can find it, I'll give them \$1."

Speaker Redmond: "The problem is that that's unintentional because that Representative has trouble making up his mind. Representative D. L. Houlihan."



Houlihan, D.: "I have a Bill on Third Reading and which I'm unaware that there's any opposition to it. It's House Bill 1568. If we want to..."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the number?"

Houlihan, D.: "...1568."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. House Bills, Third Reading, 1568."

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

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you..."

Clerk O'Brien: "...1568, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to notices. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1568 would amend the Notice Act. All this Bill does is state that if notice is required and the number of publications under the statute is not specified, it is intended that notice shall be published for two and not three successive weeks as the law presently states. That is all that this Bill does. I think it's a reasonable Bill. There is no...there is no necessity, in my opinion, for having three successive publications of notice, two..."

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

Friedland: "Mr. Speaker, I was just going to agree with the Sponsor. He's absolutely correct. It's a very good Bill."

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's 112 'aye'...114 'aye', no 'nay'; the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 698, Representative Griesheimer, Griesheimer, pardon me. Slipped."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 698, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code and the Adult Education Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Greisheimer: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 698 I know of no opposition to. It passed out of House Education Committee unanimously. What it does is it repeals three Sections of the School Code that are no longer applicable for the following reasons. The first Section has



to do with tax equivalent grants to districts where federal facilities are located. And the federal law on this has run out. So there has been no further implementation since 1976, thus, the state law is inapplicable. And...I say, inapplicable...in the second situation, it has to do with the filling of vacancies for the Office of Regional Superintendent; and there's already been a Section in the School Code adopted on this, Section 3(a)-6. So this is duplicative, and they're removing this. And the third Section that we're repealing is Section 2-3 of the Adult Education Act. And what we're doing is that we're abolishing the Adult and Continuing Education Committee, which is no longer functioning in the State of Illinois because of the establishment of the Vocational Education Advisory Committee as a federal rule. This was proposed by the State Board of Education. I believe it's completely non-controversial; and I would urge its adoption."

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

Houlihan, D.: "I have one question of the Sponsor if I may. What is the situation here as the result of the repeal respecting vacancies in the Office of Regional Superintendent?"

Griesheimer: "I'm advised that there is a new Section now which covers this exact situation, and the present law which they are repealing would be just duplicative of what was already on the books. The analysis, I'll just read it to you, that I got from the State Board, it says, 'The Bill repeals Section 3-4 to eliminate the current conflict relative to filling vacancies in the Office of Regional Superintendent of Schools. With the repeal of this Section all vacancies would be filled pursuant to 3(a)-6 of the School Code'. And as I understand it, this is the present process of the State Board of Education. The Bill was written and sponsored by the State Board of Education."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative D. L. Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "I think Representative Birchler had a question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler. Representative Hart has, I know."



Hart: "Well, I know Representative Birchler had a Bill covering the filling of vacancies from the Office of Superintendent of Public Education Regionally. And I wanted him to have a chance to take a look at this Bill before it gets over to the Senate. So I turn the microphone over to Representative Birchler; and, hopefully, there's no problem with it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker, when you're speaking of the Bill in reference to the filling of vacancies in the Office of the Regional Superintendent, at the present time under Section A in the School Code it specifically states that the Assistant or first Assistant in the Office of Regional Superintendent shall succeed the Superintendent in the event of a vacancy. That is the law under Section A of the School Code. Our Bill says that we should live by Section A of the School Code. House Bill 696 has passed this House, and it takes care of that, and it's now in the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I would presume then from Representative Birchler's comments that he's in agreement with this Bill. As I understand it, it will leave Section 3(a) in existence, which is what he is talking about, and it repeals Section 3-4. Is that correct, Representative Birchler?"

Birchler: "That's true."

Griesheimer: "All right, then I believe we are in agreement on this, and that it does follow along parallel lines with what Representative Birchler was looking for in the Bill which he sponsored."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "I have no more to say on this Bill. We passed this House the Bill that...to talk about succession."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Well, I have another Bill. I think it's noncontroversial."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the number?"



Beatty: "1094. It's close to the priority of call."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 136 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 668, Representative Terzich."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 668, a Bill for an Act in relation to employment in mines. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 668 is a Bill that came from the Law Revision Commission; and it amends the Employment Act, which was further amended in the Committee. And it deletes the sexual discriminatory language from the above Act by striking out 'boy' and replacing it with 'youth'; and changing the age of 16 from working in mines unless such work is part of a federally funded career education project. And it came out of Committee 19 to nothing."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 125 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 669."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 669, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the Civil Rights Division of the Office of Attorney General. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Breslin: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, could I be recorded as voting 'aye' on 668?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Lady have leave to be recorded as voting 'aye' on 668? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative... who?... Representative Farley, the same request. Representative... speak up, speak up... Representative Terzich on 669."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 669 is another Bill from the Law Revision Commission. It amends the Attorney General and State's Attorney's Act. The Bill merely inserts sex and national origin to the list of the discriminatory acts that the Civil Rights Division



of the Attorney General's Office is to investigate and prosecute. Again, this Bill came out of Committee 20 to nothing; and I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "D. L. Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "I have a question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Houlihan, D.: "What Committee did this come out of, Representative Terzich?"

Terzich: "It came out of the Executive Committee."

Houlihan, D.: "Could you tell me why this Bill proposes such prosecution should be in the Attorney General, rather than the State's Attorney of the respective counties?"

Terzich: "No, I cannot. However, the Attorney General presently does enforce the Civil and Equal Rights Act, and the division under the present time, under the supervision and direction of the Attorney General shall investigate all violations of the law relating to civil rights, the prevention of discrimination against persons by reason of race, color, creed or physical or mental handicap. And all we're adding is sex and national origin to that."

Houlihan, D.: "Well, approximately how many new positions will this create for the Attorney General?"

Terzich: "It wouldn't create any additional positions. All this simply does is they have the Department already, and this simply adds to it sex and national origin."

Houlihan, D.: "Well, approximately how many such cases could you reasonably anticipate; and based on those number of cases, isn't it conceivable that you are going to have to hire additional personnel in the Attorney General's Office to prosecute such cases?"

Terzich: "It's my understanding that it would not add any additional staff...Department."

Houlihan, D.: "Well, what is that understanding based upon?"

Terzich: "It's based upon Representative Hanahan's figures this afternoon."

Houlihan, D.: "Well, would you be willing to take this Bill out of the record..."

Terzich: "I shall take it out of the record."



Houlihan, D.: "...Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. How about 671? The same problem?"

Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "No problem."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummet?"

Terzich: "It has nothing to do with the Attorney General."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you explain 671? Did you read the Bill? 671."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 671, a Bill for an Act regarding...in regard to evidence and dispositions. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."

Terzich: "Yes, House Bill 669, it amends the Evidence and Disposition Act by striking 'coverture' and inserting 'marriage'. That's the only change. The kind of law meaning that the word 'coverture' refers to the condition of marriage, therefore, substituting it in its place 'marriage'. It does not alter its meaning or effect. And again this Bill came out 19 to nothing out of the Committee, Judiciary I."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Darrow: "What is the need for this Bill? Why are we changing this?"

Terzich: "These Bills originally came out of the Law Revision Commission; and most of these either have been deemed unconstitutional either by Supreme Court of the state or the Federal Supreme Court. And the word means the same, from what I understand. Coverture and marriage, Coverture means living together and it's simply inserting 'marriage'."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 118 'aye' and 1 'no'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 1094, Representative Beatty."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1094, a Bill for an Act requiring compensation for causing death by wrongful acts and negligence or default.

Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this...the intent of this Bill is to save persons with the cause of action the necessity of opening an estate and make it more convenient and also to cut the red tape. If...if the only asset to a decedent's estate is a cause of action for his wrongful death, the court will be authorized by this Bill to appoint a special administrator who will prosecute or defend the action upon a...per person...upon a motion of a person entitled to recovery under the Act, which would be normally the next of kin. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any...Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I just simply, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I...I speak simply to support this Bill. It's an excellent Bill. It will save money and costs for the decedent's estate in the case of.....accidents or wrongful death section."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? 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, 125 'aye' and no 'nay'; the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 1487."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1487, a Bill for an Act to amend the Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill which effects the Guaranteed Fund, which is presently in existence in Illinois. In so doing, unfortunately, there was a loophole, which allowed, even though there is a recovery so that nobody will be without insurance in the event a company fails, sometimes individuals or lawyers get impatient with the delay they may encounter. And, therefore, they still have the right to file suit directly against an individual who is insured with an insolvent insurance company. This Bill prevents them from so doing so long as that person was insured with the company, as you all know, the company will now be covered by the Guaranteed Fund. And this Bill



simply corrects that loophole so that no one will be the direct recipient of a suit individually. And I would ask for your favorable approval of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? You've got to be alert now. Have all voted who wished? Vote and ask questions later. Have all voted who wished? Representative Huff, for what purpose do you arise? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'aye' and 2 'no'; the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 1489. 1489 was amended today? 1494."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1494, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill which passed this House on four different occasions. Unfortunately, it does seem to get lost in the Senate. This Bill simply removes the need for a counter-signature...counter-signatures on insurance policies in Illinois. It's an old archaic habit that has been outlawed in almost every state of the Union, recommended in the past by the Insurance Study Commission. And I ask for your approval of this Bill also."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 136 'aye' and 1 'no'; the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 1626, Representative Anderson."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1626, a Bill for an Act to repeal Sections of the Illinois Valley Regional Port District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill passed out of Executive without a dissenting vote. What it does it



repeals a Section of the Illinois Valley Regional Port District, which authorizes the district to levy taxes. The Department of... Division of Aeronautics, Department of Transportation said they would never build an airport where it would cost the people of our area any taxes. The Port Authority says they would not sponsor anything that would cost the people taxes. So, therefore, let's remove the Section. And I'd certainly appreciate your 'aye' vote and answer any questions that you may have."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall... Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Could you tell us...Will the Sponsor yield to a question, Mr. Speaker? Where is the Illinois Valley Regional Port District?"

Anderson: "It takes all of Putnam County, three townships of Bureau and five townships of LaSalle County."

Lechowicz: "And would the passage of this Bill would remove the power to levy any taxes for that port district?"

Anderson: "Yes, Sir..."

Lechowicz: "That port district has been in existence since '71, what have they done since '71?"

Anderson: "...Had a few meetings and that's about it."

Lechowicz: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Representative Anderson, you're concerned...would you yield, please?"

Anderson: "Yes, Sir."

Matijevich: "Is your concern that they are going to levy taxes or what is the reason for the repeal?"

Anderson: "They are now looking at a spoil pile where strip mining had been done, and it's within 6 miles of the City of Ottawa for the ...for an airport. Now, Putnam County, parts of it, Magnolia is 32 miles from the sight; whereas, Ottawa is 6 miles from the sight. The people from Ottawa will have all the advantage and none of the responsibilities for the airport. Therefore, I think we should all be treated alike. This Bill was written and is supported by the Division of Aeronautics, which is part of the Department of



Transportation."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I might say I'm not sure, but it sounds to me like we're getting in that old airport sight that you've got in that district again, I'm not sure if that's the problem; but I've got a port district in my area and they've had the authorization to levy taxes for a good many years and haven't done it. And I'm sure that when that happens, they're going to make good use of those tax monies. And I really think, you know, this is that sleeper play that you and Fennessey and the group used to play, and we're in that old battle again. Although, we just came back, and the rest that have come back just haven't realized what you're up to yet."

Anderson: "Well, you know I wouldn't do anything like that, John."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 'aye' and 1 'no'; the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 680, Representative Pullen."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 680, a Bill for an Act to define the nature of all transactions relating to procuring furnishing, donating, processing, distributing and using human blood and blood derivatives. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill simply extends for another four years an Act which this General Assembly first adopted in 1971 and has renewed every two years since that time. It relates to the collection and transfusion of blood, and it is necessary that this Bill pass in order to keep the flow of blood going. It came out of Committee on a 14 to nothing vote; and I urge your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative D. L. Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Bill. This is a very necessary Bill. Otherwise, the present termination date is July 1, 1977. All that the Bill does is avoid strict tort



liability until such time...until such reasonable time as a medically accurate test to determine hepatitis virus can be...can be found and be practically available. The alternative to this is to have blood regarded as a sale and not as a service, and the resulting liability to the hospitals of this state would be enormous. I support Representative Pullen... I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye' and 5 'no'; the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 819, Representative Brummet."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 819..."

Speaker Redmond: "I can't see Representative Brummet, there's some pretty substantial Gentlemen between me and..."

Clerk O'Brien: "...a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Structural Pest Control Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummet."

Brummet: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All this does is to remedy some of the errors we made in the Pest Control Act, which was passed out under the Seventy-Ninth General Assembly. It's okayed by the Department of Public Health, also by the Illinois Pest Control Association. And if anyone has any questions on it, I'd be glad to answer them for you. We were a little bit too all inclusive in this; and so this is what we are doing on this, is just leaving some of it out and changing it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "I wanted to ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Hart: "Does this have anything to do with lobbyists or news media?"

Brummet: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill does have something to do with some problems that did arise with some various pest control treating agencies in downstate Illinois. And this Bill now meets all of



those problems, and I think everybody can live within the law and still have a good safe treatment of various pests in the State of Illinois. And I'd urge that everybody support this Bill."

Brummet: "This takes care of the 'Birdman of Alcatraz', is that what you mean?"

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's 148 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 825, Representative Brummet."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 825, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Finance Act and the Illinois Promotion Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Brummet: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill came out of the Tourism Commission, and it was conceived on the basis of 1963, the hotel/motel tax that was passed in the State of Illinois for the benefit of tourism. What we have done, and incidently this came out of the Committee with a 28 to nothing passage, out of Committee, and what it does it gives us part of this money for tourism in the State of Illinois. And tourism is one of our big businesses within this state, and it should be much bigger if we had some additional funds to spend on it. What it does is to take 10 percent of the funds that goes into the State Treasury from the hotel/motel tax and give it for the benefits of our Tourism Department. This is the Department that made the tax to begin with, and we feel like that we should grow along with the tax that it's bringing in. If any of you have any questions... be glad to answer them."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I object to this Bill being called out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Take it out of the record. 647. You won...647."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 647. A Bill for an Act in relation to the merit systems for sheriff's personnel. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."



Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 647 is similar to a Bill
...pardon...Okay...House Bill 647 is similar to a Bill passed..."



by this House last Session that..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "I object to this Bill being called because it definitely in my opinion is a very, very controversial Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. I think now that we have enough people here, we'd better go back to the order and the next Bill in sequence is 1036. 1036. This is where we left off when we had, before we broke for dinner."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1036. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your coming back to this. There's now a few more people here than when we first saw this Bill come up. This Bill is a Board of Elections Bill. It creates a twelve-member board, three Democrats and three Republicans from Cook County, three Democrats and three Republicans from downstate. In developing this Bill, I worked with Leadership of both sides. It doesn't satisfy everybody completely, but it does seem to be acceptable to both sides. The Bill provides for downstate representation. By having twelve members and a quorum of nine and also ends a lot of the problems with a tie vote. I think a tie vote would be very unlikely with this board. This board also includes a number of the reforms such as prohibiting employees and members of the board from being involved in political activity while they're on the board. It limits the consulting contracts that the board can enter into. And finally, it says that the members of the board will not get any big salaries. They'll merely be paid fifty dollars every time they go to a meeting. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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? Representative Byers."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a board... that creates a new State Board of Elections. They're going to have twelve members now and they're going to be equally divided between six Democrats and six Republicans and I think we do have a crisis and we can be



responsive to the people by answering that crisis and giving the Senate something to work with over there. This Bill passed out of the Elections Committee. There's bipartisan support and I think that the members are approved by both the House and the Senate by a three-fifths vote and that's about as fair as you can get. And I would urge 89 votes for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to help this vote, this Bill pass and hope that they'll use the same Roll Call for House Bill 254. Obviously, this is not the same construction of the State Board of Elections that is in my Bill and I do have one objection to it. And that is both Houses confirming the members. So I think if we're going to get off dead center on this whole issue and the conflict that's occurring, we've got to pass Bills which can become reasonable. And I think the twelve-member concept with six from Cook County and six from downstate has potential. Therefore, even though I'm not totally satisfied with the make-up of this Bill, I think it's something that we ought to consider and send to the Senate for their consideration, so I'm giving it a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of House Bill 1036. I feel it represents a reasonable and fair compromise with regard to the creation of a new State Board of Elections. The issue has been clouded at times between those members who wanted a small-member, even-numbered board and those members who wanted a small-numbered, five-member board which had an odd numbered tie breaker. This proposal gives the flexibility to the board to create a decision-making body that will not be constantly paralyzed by a squaring off of two members against two members. It provides for twelve members which will give enough flexibility for there to be a reasonable discussion of the issues and a determination of those issues even when those issues happen to be downstate versus upstate or Republican versus Democrat. It would make for a mechanism to deciding the issues. And I would suggest that more Members vote for this Bill



because it is a reasonable compromise in the creation of a State Board of Elections."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished?"

J. Houlihan: "Particularly Representative Marovitz."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also rise to support this Bill. A twelve-member board is only 165 members short of the 177 Members we have here in the House and should we ever have single-Member districts, there'll be a place for all of us on the State Board of Elections."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

The first of at least three or four Bills that will deal with the effort to solve the Elections Commission problem, if we can't pass out one Bill, I don't foresee us having much success with some of those that have been more controversial, including the Kempiner's Bill. And although he's acting, I presume, on good faith, there are a number of his Members that are voting 'present'. I see that's true also of Members on our side of the aisle and I think we have a proposal at 380 that is favored by a lot of Members. But I think this takes a lot of us to participate in to get 89 votes. If we're going to stand around and oppose one Member's Bill and try to get the other person's out, I think that's in error. We're going to have to solve the problem and I think we can do it by addressing ourselves to all of the Bills and moving them along uniformly so that eventually we can make a decision on which of the combinations we can agree on. So, I think unless we can pass out 1036, we're faced with the problem of being unable to pass out not only the Kempiners and Bradley Bills, but any others that are accommodated to those three."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Robinson. Robinson, to explain his vote."

Robinson: "I understand there is some problem with a very minor Section in the Bill that has nothing to do with the key issues in the Bill so I'd like to put it on postponed."

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



E. Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would just like to urge more green votes up there. This is the best Bill that we do have going here. It solves a crisis that we're facing here in this State of Illinois and I do think it deserves the support of us to help solve a crisis that we have facing us. And I think that we should from both sides of the aisle, give more support to this legislation which is really needed at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? All voted who wished? Clerk will... Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 77 'aye' and 18 'no'. Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "I'd like to put it on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. 1072, what's the status of that one now? Out of the record. 1101, Representative Leverenz here?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1101. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Illinois Legislative Council. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz. Leverenz, 1101."

Leverenz: "Take it out."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1111. Out of the record. Representative Skinner. 1187, Representative Jaffe."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1187. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections and the title of the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this amends the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act. And basically what it does is it requires reporting of cases of venereal disease in children under twelve years of age and it requires an investigation thereof by the Department of Children and Family Services. The Bill defines venereal disease and we find that this Bill is absolutely necessary if we were going to gather all the cases of sexual abuse in this particular case in this particular state and I would solicit an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill



pass? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this was a Bill that was considered by the Judiciary II Committee and which was not reported out unanimously. I think there was a concern, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, relative to the reporting to a state agency of the incident of a social disease contracted by an individual and which would become a part of that individual's record subject to scrutiny... my person, subsequently... and which may have a detrimental effect upon that individual. As a consequence, Mr. Speaker, in terms of privacy and the sanctity of an individual's record, I would suggest a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just say that this Bill has nothing to do with privacy. As you know, venereal disease has to be reported at the present time to the Department of Public Health. All this Bill says is now that they have to report over to the Department of Children and Family Services so that Children and Family Services can make an investigation for sexual abuse of children. We're talking about kids who are eleven years of age and under. Those are the kids that we're trying to protect and I think it's really sort of, just off the wall, to hear the comments of the prior speaker talking about privacy. Well, privacy has nothing to do with this Bill whatsoever. There is nothing that will impinge upon privacy and I would solicit an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye'... Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, aside from the fact that we've had some very interesting note-sending around here, I would like to support this Bill because, after all, we did have hearings in the Rape Study Committee and found there were cases of children eighteen months of age had gonorrhea and stuff like that and this is just a mere protection for children who have been abused and I think it's a good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished?"

Geo-Karis: "And happy hunting ground, Harold."



Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question, 122 'ayes' and 13 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Matijevich, to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I was going to say whoever thought he was playing a trick on Adams, he got the last laugh."

Speaker Redmond: "1211. Representative Hanahan. Representative Schlickman. 1211. Representative Schlickman. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I would just suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we may recess for five minutes we can collect our wits and whatever else is important in this Body."

Speaker Redmond: "No. Representative Geo-Karis. Let's all be serious here. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have Harold Adams come back and help us."

Speaker Redmond: "1211, Representative Hanahan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1211. A Bill for an Act making a supplemental appropriation to the State Board of Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, after having spent seven terms here, I've witnessed this a few times and it's as funny today as it was seven terms ago."

Speaker Redmond: "You were a better actor though."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 1211 is the supplemental appropriation to the Office of Education for the sums of nine million, one hundred and forty-five thousand, six hundred dollars from the General Revenue Fund; two million, three hundred and fifteen thousand, two hundred dollars from the Common School Fund; and three million, four hundred, ninety-seven thousand, five hundred and forty-five dollars from Federal funds. Total appropriation is fourteen million, nine hundred, fifty-eight thousand, three hundred and forty-five dollars. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this supplemental appropriation is caused because the state law mandates the amount of money school districts must expend in behalf of special education children,



both in transportation and education grants. And this money is needed to keep the commitment that we have with our local school districts to pay for the costs of this education that we mandate. Last year when passing the Office of Education budget, we... I was the Sponsor of the Bill and I stood on the floor of this House and I said these were the amounts of money that were needed last year and had this... had the Governor not amendatorily vetoed the budget and the Legislature reduced the appropriation. These amount of monies were the exact amount of monies that were asked for in the appropriation of the Office of Education last year and the money is necessary just to catch up and to keep even with our commitment to schools around this state and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Skinner: "I wonder if my colleague could tell me if this is in the Governor's budget."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Which Governor?"

Skinner: "The present Governor."

Hanahan: "I haven't seen his budget requests, Representative Skinner, in this area. I believe that he has plans on spending the money somehow. But the fact is, this money is owed from last Governor's budget, not from this Governor's budget."

Skinner: "Well, I wonder if anybody on the floor knows if it is in the Governor's budget because if it isn't, it would seem to me this is another chapter in the game or move in the game of buck the budget."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, at the proper time I want to speak against this Bill, but I would like to announce that Representative Adams is back on the floor and tells me that he wants to thank you fellows. That's his sister in the balcony. Is it appropriate... is this the right time, Mr. Speaker, to expound my..."

Speaker Redmond: "Nothing else pending, I guess. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill contains 11.2 million dollars worth of General



Revenue Funds that are not in the Governor's budget. Now, we've been over this Bill. Last week we tried to amend it down, were not successful. I would certainly hope that tonight we could use a little common sense and a little fiscal integrity and vote 'no' on this proposal. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I don't know how much longer we can bring the news to the General Assembly about the difficulties of funding the Common School Fund and making more money available for general distribution. But once again, I'd like to make a case for that especially since we do not full fund any educational formula for special ed. Special ed. is served very well in the State of Illinois. We are probably among the top states throughout the country in dealing with the problems of special education. I think we ought to defeat this proposal so that the next time which is very soon obviously within the next month or so, while we have an opportunity to deal with education funding, we can be sure that the ten million dollars that is becoming a supplemental this spring, will not be deleted from our consideration for funds for this coming month. One last observation and that is, school boards as well as special education people know that there is an apportionment clause in the special education funding section that alerts school districts as well as beneficiaries from the special ed. funding that if there is not enough money there, it will be generally distributed as best it can be. We have an obligation to offer the best education we can. But we also have an obligation to be aware of the cost and the realities of trying to formulate next year's school aid formula and funding proposals and so I would ask that... we've done our best for this fiscal year and I would ask that we defeat this Bill as it stands."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative G.L. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to bring two or three things to the attention of the Legislature, some of which may be redundant of what previous speakers have said due to the fact that it was difficult to hear what they were saying.



I'd like to make two or three points. Number one, all funding programs for the state provide for proration; all state funding programs in education provide for proration. It's not a question of whether one owes or does not owe, the question is whether one has the funds to pay. We determined that when we made the appropriation last spring. This fund is not for General Revenue. This is a special program and let me remind you that eight million dollars or probably ten million dollars of this money is being counted on in the Governor's budget in the seventy-five million dollars new money for general distribution. Now, all children, all children, regardless of their category, qualify for the general distributive formula. So what... the State Board of Education from whom this Bill came, what the State Board of Education is recommending is that we take money from the vast majority of students in the next fiscal year to deal with less than 12% of the total population in the state. Now, these... this 12% are going to qualify under the general distribution formula, I can't..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Hoffman: "I can't emphasize enough that in the general distributive formula, all students are counted, all students are counted. If we pass this supplemental appropriation and it were to become law, we would, in effect, be taking away from 100% of the children in the general distributive formula next year. All programs were apportioned last year - general distribution, transportation and special education. We made a sound decision at that time. The State Board of Education is not making a sound decision at this time. And in all deference to the Sponsor, I would ask the other Members of the General Assembly to join me and Representative Ryan and Representative Schneider and others and vote 'no' on this supplemental appropriation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, I was wondering if the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mudd: "Representative Hanahan, for my information and maybe some of the others on the floor, would you... isn't it true that there's three point some million dollars worth of Federal money in this



supplemental appropriation?"

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there's a two million dollar appropriation from Federal funds on basic vocational education. There's a seven hundred thousand dollar supplemental request on consumer and homemaking. There is a one hundred, ninety-three thousand, five hundred and forty-five from cooperative education programs. There's a six hundred thousand dollar appropriation supplemental request on work studies. So these are all Federal funds that need to be placed into the hands of the Office of Education and unless this Bill is moved out of this House, people could complain about losing their Amendments last week, but they're holding up these kinds of programs in the Office of Education if this Bill does not move out. It's up to each Member here to vote his own switch."

Mudd: "Also, Representative Hanahan, are these matching funds?"

Hanahan: "These are... no. Some are matching funds, some are not. There's all different kinds of programs here."

Mudd: "I don't believe these are matching funds and I think that the wise thing for the House to do would be to adopt this Bill and have all the funds that the Governor had to appropriate out of state funds vetoed so that we could collect the Federal funds out of this supplemental appropriation. It's easy to fund the Common School Fund if you're going to take a simple formula like cutting the Road Fund and Higher Education to do it. That's the easy way to do it, but I think it's going to cause a problem all the way around if we don't adopt this Bill and take the Federal funds out of it and go ahead and veto whatever state funds the Governor wants used. I also... we don't get into a position where we use federally earmarked funds by juggling the figures for special education and put them in the Common School and say that we're not supporting the minority of 12% for handicapped and children who need special education just so we can support Common School."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "The Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Anderson: "Tom, the Federal funds, how will we lose them? There's no



matching to that, is there?"

Hanahan: "I'm sorry, Sir, I can't hear."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Anderson: "As far as matching funds are concerned, there's none needed for the Federal funds. Is that correct?"

Hanahan: "I'm sorry, Representative, but I can't hear you."

Speaker Redmond: "Break up the caucus over here."

Hanahan: "I can't hear with all these meetings going on."

Speaker Redmond: "Hoffman, Mudd. It's very noisy. Representative Hanahan."

Anderson: "Representative Hanahan, we will not lose any Federal funds, will we? They'll just go into next years. There's no match here at all needed."

Hanahan: "One of the penalties is the timeliness of the application for some Federal funds and on basic vocational education, for example, the appropriation is needed to expend the additional two million dollars. Now, according to my booklet here in that specific program, basic vocational education, the money is needed now, not later."

Anderson: "Well, our staff... would it be possible to take it out for a second and get our staff together here? Our staff says 'no', we're not going to lose any Federal funds."

Hanahan: "Representative Anderson, this Bill has been held and held and held for everyone to study it. I'm using the guidelines given to me by the Office of Education and it's all in writing, taxpayers paid for this and it shows here why the appropriations are needed and how much could be carried over and how much can't. For example, and here's right out of their writing. - I don't know where your staff is getting their information, but on consumer and home-making programs, the supplemental request is seven hundred thousand but only five hundred thousand could be carried over. Those are the kinds of answers I've got written down here in this booklet."

Anderson: "Well, Representative Hanahan, our staff tells me that I.O.E. will put in their '78 budget, the Federal funds, if this Bill doesn't pass."



Hanahan: "That I don't know. I'm handling their budget Bill and it's in. I haven't been apprised of that. I'm the Chief Sponsor of the Office of Education Budget Bill and nobody has told me that."

Anderson: "All right, I have a couple other questions. What are we funding common school transportation at, what percentage? Do you know? Right now."

Hanahan: "Pardon me, Sir."

Anderson: "What percentage are we funding common school transportation for fiscal year '77? This is a supplemental, isn't it?"

Hanahan: "Yes, this is a supplemental. We don't have in this supplemental budget a request for the Common School Transportation Fund."

Anderson: "Would you believe 78%?"

Hanahan: "Sir, I don't have this in front of me. I can't answer..."

Anderson: "Right now, the special education is funded at 92 and if this Bill should pass, they'll be funded at 100%."

Hanahan: "No, it's... first of all, the School Code requires only 80% of the cost of transportation. You talk about 100% of the 80."

Anderson: "Right, that's correct."

Hanahan: "You're not talking about 100% of the cost?"

Anderson: "No. The other thing is, Representative Hanahan, the Governor has said there is going to be seventy-five million for elementary and secondary and eight of this million he knew was going to lapse when he said this, so instead of seventy-five million if we pass this Bill, it'll be what? Sixty-seven million?"

Hanahan: "Well, I disagree with his observation that we knew it would last. He also knew he had a debt obligation that when we said a year ago this is the amount of money that we're mandating our local school districts to expend and this money is reimbursed to that local school district, this Governor, while he campaigned, pledged his support to schools. Now, if he wants to renege on that campaign promise, that's his business, not mine. I'm going to vote for this kind of Bill."

Anderson: "I don't think he's reneged on anything. I think that what has happened, previous Governor..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your questions to a close, please."

Anderson: "All right, I'd like to speak on the Bill. I'm certainly



opposed to this Bill. We can get these Federal funds in next year's appropriation. We're not going to lose anything. The eight million dollars that is in this Bill is already in the Governor's proposal for the seventy-five million for the Common School for next fiscal year and I urge it's defeat."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Gentleman from DuPage indicated that we're paying this money out to certain children, not to other children. He knows very well this money is going to school districts. It's not going to reimburse any children. It's going to school districts who have followed loyally the mandate that we set upon them to provide these special programs under our promise that they would be reimbursed certain funds. And all we're doing is reimbursing these funds. And when the funds are reimbursed, they're free to spend them any way they want. When the funds come back to the school district which they've already spent... they've already spent these funds. They're going to the General Revenue of the school districts. We're not sending this money to some children as opposed to other children. All we're doing here is sending to those districts that believed in what we said, when we mandated that they provide these programs. They provided the programs and now they're being reimbursed for that. And when this money comes back, it's just going to their General Revenue of the school district. The money's already been spent by the school districts. It's going to reimburse them for money they spent six months or a year or more ago. And certainly this Bill is needed. It carries out the promise that we made to school districts under the mandate where we required them to provide these services and I intend to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the funds in this Bill are earmarked for special purposes. I do not dispute the motives at all of the Sponsor in presenting this Bill to the House. He has sponsored the appropriations for education for a period of time and we all know of his great interest in education, especially as a result... as it deals with special education and aid for the



hand, we have supported him in the past and... (malfunctioning equipment)... I think, however, in this particular instance, with eight weeks, less than six weeks left in the school year and we all must realize that this money cannot really be effectively spent. Further, in answer to some of the questions brought up here in regard to the \$3.2 million of Federal money, whether this Bill passes or does not pass, that \$3.2 million will not be lost to the state, but will be available for a reappropriation to be used beginning July 1. I ask you to search yourselves, search your hearts. It's exactly what we want to approach the problem of education, whether we want to approach the problem of education, whether towards full funding or whether we are going to vote towards full funding or whether we are going to in my estimation which is very finally motivated, but which, of course, and the estimation of others involved in the field for a long time is not going to solve this problem. I ask you now

Speaker Reed: "I move on this particular Bill. Thank you."

McGrew: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Reed: "Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall all the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye' and those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Hanahan,

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, fiscal integrity is a nice-sounding phrase that's used around the Legislature. But how many people went down in history because they had no fiscal integrity. You tell me what great citizens of America had ever been renowned because they had fiscal integrity. I'll tell you a lot of citizens that are revered throughout history because they took care of people who took care of themselves. They took care of kids, they took care of old folks. People like Jane Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln name the persons we revere in history - Harry Truman. I'll bet you you can't tell me what he did on fiscal integrity."



Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order."

Hanahan: "Talk about phony issues, a few minutes ago when we were talking about increased lawyer's salaries, it was all right not to have fiscal integrity. I'd like to see some of those green lights on the increase on lawyer's salaries that were not in the Governor's budget, now bring forward a green vote for special education. We're talking about here two million, five hundred and forty-five thousand dollars of responsible voting because those Members, those of you who served last Session didn't do one damn thing to change the formula that says, you're going to reimburse your local school districts for that money that you mandated them to spend in special education personnel... (Malfunction of recording equipment) ...six million, four hundred thousand dollars of monies owed by this General Assembly for monies our school districts spent and you talk about fiscal integrity. This is integrity. How about good, old-fashioned common sense? How about good, old-fashioned common honesty that you mandated the school districts to spend this money. Now be honest enough to pay them for it and don't be worrying about the phony issues of fiscal integrity. Your citizens back home in your school districts don't give a damn about your fiscal integrity. They do care about your word because when they voted for you, they expected you to keep it. And I hope you're going to keep it when this Roll Call goes up there for House Bill 1211."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Lucco, to explain his vote."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to vote 'yes' in support of this Bill. You want to keep in mind that this is money that schools have already spent because we, the Legislature, mandated that these programs be carried on. And I think that we should support them by funding this program, these programs now."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. Whoops, whoops, what's up? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Don't look now, but



I think somebody is here to serve a subpoena on us. He's over there near Representative Walsh. Judge Duff. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 81 'aye' and 54 'no'. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Can I place this Bill on Postponed Consideration? Poll the absentees first, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. The Clerk is very sorry, but he hit the wrong button. The question is on the... he has the Roll Call. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bartulis, Bluthardt, Boucek, Caldwell, Campbell, Dyer, Ebbesen, Ewell, Giglio, Kelly, Kornowicz, Kucharski, Madison, Mann, Schoeberlein, Schuneman, Sevcik, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, is there a copy of this Roll Call available to the citizens of the state?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah."

Hanahan: "Because I think there's an awful lot of school districts back home that would be interested in it."

Speaker Redmond: "There is a copy available."

Hanahan: "Then I request Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan, you going to go with the Roll Call or did you want anything else? The Gentleman has requested it be on Postponed Consideration. 1218. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Speaker, it's a matter of practice and tradition in this House that whenever a Bill goes on Consideration Postponed, that the Roll Call is dumped. That has never happened any other way. Now, Mr. Speaker, for the Clerk to have given the Roll Call to the of this... Sponsor of this Bill when he asked that the Bill be placed on Consideration Postponed, it's a violation of tradition of practice. And by your having given to him that Roll Call through the Clerk, this Bill should be declared defeated, lost."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. Now that we've got the 70-vote rule, we cannot dump a Roll Call. There's no way that we



determine if a Roll Call has seventy votes officially unless you have that Roll Call. And say that as a point of order we can no longer dump a Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, is that in the record? Is that Roll Call in the record? Is it in the record, though? It's not in the record. It's not journalized. It's not journalized, not journalized. It is not journalized. 1218. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's certainly no secret that Clerk O'Brien handed the only copy of that Roll Call to Representative Hanahan and I certainly think that if you're going to play the game that way that all ought to have a copy of that Roll Call and at least if not, maybe we'd better replace the Clerk. He conveniently dumped it. Now he's passed out the only copy. It certainly doesn't speak well for him, nor you, Mr. Speaker. And I would certainly hope that you'd rectify that immediately."

Speaker Redmond: "1218, Representative Dunn."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1218. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Library System Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

R. Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. 1218 is a Library Bill. This Bill is needed to provide for a program of annual state grants administered by the State Librarian for up to 25% of the total construction costs of public libraries. It authorizes a special grant not to exceed 50% of the total appropriation for construction of a library and the new Chicago Public Library. I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor... Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Hoffman: "What is the cost of this Bill to the state?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

R. Dunn: "This Bill... Companion Bill is two million dollars of C.D.B. funds for authorization to be used for construction of library and library grants."

Hoffman: "Who is going to pay the two million dollars back? Who's



going to pay the bonds?"

R. Dunn: "The people of the State of Illinois. Who pays our bonds are the people of the State of Illinois."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want to make sure that in the confusion of the last Bill that we didn't miss what Representative Dunn just said. This Bill is two million dollars out of the Capital Development Fund which will go to Library Districts and will be included in the debt of the State of Illinois and it will be the responsibility of this General Assembly to pay this money back. Now, we had an argument over the last Bill and I think the better part of wisdom prevails. It seems to me that a similar mood ought to prevail on this particular piece of legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Point of order. As I see it, we're not on the Appropriation Bill, are we?"

Speaker Redmond: "We're on 1218."

Matijevich: "And I thought we had a Gentleman's agreement that we'd keep Bills on Second Reading when a Companion Appropriation Bill is still in Appropriations Committee. And I don't think we ought to be advancing this Bill when the money Bill is still in the Committee. And I would request that the Sponsor hold it over here until we move the other Bill out of Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn. Sounds like a good idea. He takes it out of the record. 1266. Matijevich. Out of the record. 1272."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1272. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 7... 1272 amends the portion of the Municipal Code dealing with annexation. The law presently provides that annexation proceedings may be initiated by a petition of voters and property owners in the territory being annexed or by ordinance passed by the corporate authorities of the annexing municipality.



In either case, the petition or ordinance is filed with a Circuit Court Clerk. The Judge of the Circuit Court sets a hearing on the petition or ordinance and if the ordinance or petition is in order, he will order an election of the territory or the municipality. What this Bill does is provide that if a municipality or territory lies in more than one county, then a petition or ordinance is to be filed with the Clerk of the Circuit Court in each county involved. The Bill further provides that each county in which the petition or ordinance has been filed has venue and that the group who initiated the annexation, the petitioners or the corporate authorities may select the county in which to have the manner of annexation heard. The intention of the Bill is to avoid any confusion or ambiguity existing in the law as currently written and insure that annexation cases are heard before the court which is likely to be the most knowledgeable about the situation. Now this Bill has bipartisan support, passed out of the Cities and Villages Committee with a unanimous vote and I would appreciate a favorable vote on House Bill 1272."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "A question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Leinenweber: "Representative Yourell, what communities have experienced problems in this area?"

Yourell: "I don't have that in my summary, but I'm sure there are some. Park Forest, I've heard here."

Leinenweber: "The only reason I ask that, as I understand the... there's very little other than ministerial duties involved on the part of the court and one of these petitions. In other words, just to see whether or not the, you know, if the allegations of the petition are true, I really wonder why you need this Bill. I didn't know there was a problem in that area."

Yourell: "Well, apparently, there is a problem. The Municipal League is in support of the legislation and where there are annexations that take place in one or more or two counties, then the problem exists and it's a problem with the determination and the judicial determination under which county has venue. Both counties have



venue and the majority, of course, rules and all we're trying to do is clarify the law to avoid any confusion that might exist at the present time."

Leinenweber: "Is the question concerning the property to be annexed being in both counties or the municipality annexing the property in both counties?"

Yourell: "Right, that's correct."

Leinenweber: "Which one?"

Yourell: "Well, it's both. In other words, say Park Forest is in both Will and Cook County and if they choose to annex, as I understand the law now, if they choose to annex property, they could file in either Will or Cook based upon the Civil Practice Act."

Leinenweber: "Now, are you talking about a piece of property that might straddle the county line?"

Yourell: "Might be in both counties, yes."

Leinenweber: "Is that the situation you're aiming at?"

Yourell: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Waddell. And the Parliamentarian come to the podium please."

Waddell: "Questioner of the Sponsor. Any provisions of this change the existing law as to the people that they want to annex? Could I ask you a question? If they do not wish to be annexed..."

Yourell: "This does not change that."

Waddell: "Doesn't change it?"

Yourell: "No."

Waddell: "Thank you."

Yourell: "The petition or the ordinance has to be there before any action could be taken."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Van Duyne: "Representative Yourell, could you elaborate on that? Since you allude to something that has to do with Will County and Cook, could it be Stager or somewhere over there and having to do with Representative Leinenweber and my Bill for the..."

Yourell: "Well, may I yield your question to a Gentleman that seems



to know the areas? Representative Conti seems to know the areas that are concerned."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Well, you have Bensenville, you have Elgin, you have Park Forest, you have all those collar counties that are around Cook County that have a major portion of the municipality in Cook County and you have one-third, even though the area's a lot larger but the population isn't as great in another county. But every one of your collar counties around Cook County..."

Van Duyne: "Well, Representative Conti, are you thinking of starting a new county?"

Conti: "No, just talking about the going to which county that they would have the best chance of getting a fair hearing."

Van Duyne: "A fair hearing for what?"

Conti: "For whatever the problem that they have in their particular county."

Van Duyne: "Yeah, but the Bill here speaks specifically of annexation."

Conti: "Yes, there are many unincorporated areas around the collar counties that are seeking annexation. Now, for municipalities, I'm talking about municipalities, not their annexation to counties."

Yourell: "Representative Van Duyne, I don't know of any specific incidents that involves Will County if that's what you're speaking to."

Van Duyne: "Well, just let me... I know you're all smart enough to read the Digest, but it just says here, '1272 amends the Illinois Municipal Code, provides that petitions for annexation shall be filed with all Circuit Court Clerks.' And as far as I go, you know, that means that you're going to either deannex or you must deannex from one county in order to be annexed to another. And I don't know, you know... I'm not the smartest guy in this General Assembly, but this is sufficient enough to confuse me to vote 'no'."

Yourell: "Can I go back, Representative Van Duyne, and say again, all this does is provide that annexation proceedings may be initiated by a petition of voters and property owners in the territory being annexed or by ordinance passed by the corporate authorities of the annexing municipality? In either case, the petition must be filed



in... a Clerk of the Circuit Court. And when there's two counties involved, it must be filed in each county and venue is given to each county and the county with the most knowledge and the most territory would have the venue."

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

Deuster: "If the Sponsor would yield for a question, you just made a statement that the hearing would be held in the area where there was the most geography or the most territory. I don't see that in the Bill and that was my problem. As I read the Bill, it says that you file a petition in all the different counties. Then I have one Community, Barrington, that's in Lake, McHenry, Kane and Cook. I get the impression that the petitioners could pick out any county they wanted to for the hearing."

Yourell: "All right, let me explain that. The Bill was introduced because of an annexation case where the court ruled that the case should be heard in the county where the city hall was located even though a majority of the municipality and the territory was in a different county. And that's what we're trying to straighten out in the law. That's all it means."

Deuster: "I see. Had you thought of any standards, you thought of that and rejected it, did you, of any standards of requiring the hearing where the... most of the territory was?"

Yourell: "That's in the Bill."

Deuster: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? All voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1327. Out of the record. 1393. Out of the record. 1416, Representative Kozubowski. You saying 'ouch' or 'out'? 1517. Representative Mautino. 1517. Representative Luft, I can't see Representative Mautino. 1517."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1517. A Bill for an Act to authorize the recovery of excess privilege tax collected and paid by the state. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

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

1517 does exactly what the synopsis said. It permits a citizen to sue the Department of Revenue for excessive tax charges which he cannot collect from the Department now. In most cases, they are small sums, but there are no avenues for a taxpayer to receive his overpaid taxes either through R.O.T. or service occupation tax and this will be the vehicle to make that happen. I ask for Affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative Totten."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Totten: "What would the Department of Revenue estimate it might cost them to administer this?"

Mautino: "Virtually nothing. Now, the situation is that they do not have any avenue to pay back a consumer who overpays his taxes. What they do is pay back... if... they pay back the retailer if he applies for his return or overpayment. There is no avenue, there would virtually be no tax loss and no cost to the State of Illinois."

Totten: "What's the Department's position on the Bill?"

Mautino: "They were not adamantly opposed. I think their comment in the Revenue Committee was we do have a problem in the area. We don't think that the suit is the way to solve it, but they said also they could not solve it under their own existing procedures and policies. That question was raised by Representative Campbell at that time."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Daniels: "Who defends the state?"

Mautino: "Pardon?"

Daniels: "Who defends the state in this lawsuit?"

Mautino: "I would assume there are a lot of attorneys in the Revenue



Department, but I also believe there's a Department of Government in the Attorney General's office and I would assume... but if he's going to get involved with ten and twenty dollar claims, I'm sure that he has more important things to do."

Daniels: "Well, have you checked with any of these offices to find the approximate cost of defending, you know, as far as fiscal application?"

Mautino: "The Revenue Department said there was no additional costs."

Daniels: "Well, I don't believe the Revenue Department though. If a suit was filed against the State of Illinois, it would be filing an appearance in this case."

Mautino: "Well, it's only an avenue."

Daniels: "Really the question I have, I understand what you're saying on the problem and I support your legislation. But the following question I have is, if it's necessary and there's an additional appropriation necessary for the Attorney General's office for this particular subject, I assume that you will support that appropriation?"

Mautino: "I supported the supplemental last..."

Daniels: "I know you did and I..."

Mautino: "Just thought I'd..."

Daniels: "You would support it in this case, though, right? Right?"

Mautino: "Fine, no problem."

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? Clerk will take the record. On this question 130 'aye' and 15 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1713."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1713. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider, out of the record? Are you ready?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."



Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 1713 was heard in the Counties and Townships Committee. What this does is allow the community college in that area and other kinds of areas that have similar arrangements to utilize the Public Building Commission to construct projects on sites that relate to community kinds of project, such as auditoriums and stadiums. It does not allow or authorize the construction of classrooms and similar kinds of facilities since that would be in violation of the Public Building, rather Capital Development Board, and I would ask the endorsement and passage of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I'm not sure I believe I heard what I heard. Is this a way to avoid allowing the public to vote on whether a community college should have something like a gymnasium or a stadium with artificial turf?"

Schneider: "No. I used the stadium as an example, but basically we're talking about auditoriums because we went to the Capital Development Board about what are the limitations within that language and they argued and convincingly that that's the only kind of facility you could build. But you do it with revenue bonds."

Skinner: "Well, I don't know why you don't rip the state off the way all these other civic center people are doing."

Schneider: "I'm a reasonable person."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question? Representative Schneider, under this Bill you're going to take away from the Capital Development Board the power of site selection and..."

Schneider: "We take nothing away from the Capital Development Board. Their authority still stands. What we do is work within the structure of the Public Building Commission in that area."

Hanahan: "Well, you authorize the Commission, the Public Building Commission to select and locate and designate project sites for the community college district. What, in effect, are you doing here to the Capital Development Board? Right now, they have that power."

Schneider: "Well, we don't take that away. What that authorizes,



Representative Hanahan, is the construction of such a site with the approval. As I said, we talked, I talked rather extensively with C.D.B. on that. We take away none of their powers and allow it to occur with the agreement of C.D.B., with that Public Building Commission and with the community college."

Hanahan: "Could you possibly maybe make it easy on me? Could you cite an example, a factual example of where you have a problem that you want to change a law?"

Schneider: "The factual experience would be DuPage Communigy College has an interest in building an auditorium. They would find it, I think, agreeable and the Public Building Commission would also, that they could use that Public Building Commission Act to construct that facility. That's the specific example and we need it to clarify the language because in the Capital Development Board language... our references rather, to school districts. It does not, however, make specific references, let's say, that might include community colleges. They as a college interpret it to be true that they could be, they are able rather to build under Public Building Commission Act. However, this language clarifies that; does not alter in any way the functions of the Capital Development Board."

Hanahan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentlemen standing between the Chair and Representative Hudson. Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Yes, let's take care of that situation. Would the Sponsor yield? J. Glenn, would you explain again, maybe you have and maybe I missed it how this would affect the county similar to, like DuPage' where..."

Schneider: "I just did."

Hudson: "All right, where does the..."

Schneider: "Wheaton has a Public Building Commission."

Hudson: "Yes, right."

Schneider: "We would now be authorized or the college would be authorized to construct a facility of general community use. For example,



an auditorium would not be necessarily a college auditorium but would include community activities. This clarifies the language that refers to school districts but makes it clear in this process that community colleges are eligible for revenue sharing. Not revenue sharing, revenue bonds."

Hudson: "Well, I think what I'm... my question is, would they have to work through the Wheaton P.B.C. to do this?"

Schneider: "Right."

Hudson: "Has nothing to do with the county and yet you're Bill, you talk about County Public Building Commissions."

Schneider: "There was at least in my mind somewhere along the route another Bill like this, but this one is the Wheaton Public Building Commission and not the County Building Commission."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question? Is there any way by this Bill that the Community College Board could establish his own Building Commission?"

Schneider: "No."

Tuerk: "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? Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "If there is any uncertainty about it, again it affects pretty basically just our area. The city does this already and therefore, offers no conflict. But it's a similar proposal. That is, we're bringing it into conformity with their action."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I... if I'm hearing what I think I'm hearing, I'm not in support of the Bill. If I'm hearing something other, I'd like to be insured so that I could support the Bill. And I don't to question at this point because I don't think it's proper. But if I'm not mistaken, we're giving the authorization for community colleges to build under the Public Building Commission Act and then also give them full authority on local control of the project. And if that's what I'm hearing, I can't support the Bill."



But if that's not true, I can."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider. He asked a question."

Mudd: "Yeah, what I feel is that we're bringing community colleges into Public Building Commission construction and allowing them to be built under Public Building Commissions and then again, allowing them full local control of that project."

Schneider: "The Public Building Commission."

Mudd: "Right and with state money."

Schneider: "Well, as I explained earlier, the language for school districts is already in there. What it does is expand on that in terms of community colleges because it appears that they are eligible. However, there's uncertainty in the minds of those people that would like to go forward with such a project. So I think it's probably consistent with all the individuals or groups that would be involved."

Mudd: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 76 'aye' and 20 'no'. The Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. 1740."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1740. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Local Governmental and Governmental Employees Tort Immunity Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker. I would ask leave of the House to return 1740 to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, 1740 returned to the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, McGrew. Amends House Bill 1740 on page 1 by deleting everything after line 9 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this Amendment does it removes the word 'fire'... well, let me back up and say that the Bill is to provide, to remove tort immunity for the trustees of the Fire Protection District. This Amendment would remove the Fire



Protection District itself from that exemption from immunity. And secondly, it adds the qualification at the end that the Bill which states that it covers only those situations where the firefighting equipment must cross a bridge with load limits lower than the weight of such equipment. It makes the Bill in much more precise language in intent of the Bill. I move for it's adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any questions? Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

McMaster: "Sam, I had a call from the superintendent of highways in Mercer County this afternoon and he was concerned about the legislation. I think that you are, as I understand it, exempting the Fire Protection Districts from any responsibility in crossing bridges that... in which they are over the weight limit."

McGrew: "No, Sir. This Bill does, this Amendment removes the Fire Protection District itself from that exemption and leaves it so that the trustees of such a Fire Protection District are exempt."

McMaster: "The trustees are exempt, but then the responsibility falls, therefore, upon the Fire Protection District itself."

McGrew: "That is correct."

McMaster: "Thank you, Sam."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Leinenweber: "Sam, is the damage by which the trustees, the officers and employees are exempt solely to the bridge, is that what... in other words, if the truck goes through the bridge?"

McGrew: "That is correct. It would remove the responsibility to replace such a bridge by the individual trustees if they were sued and found negligent."

Leinenweber: "Who would them stand the cost of replacing the bridge?"

McGrew: "Well, it would be entirely up to however the courts would settle it if the Amendment were adopted because the Fire Protection District itself could be sued to replace the bridge. If the court did not find in that favor, I would assume that it would be up to the state if it were a state bridge, the county if it were a



county bridge or the township if it were a township bridge."

Leinenweber: "Is the gist, the thrust of this Bill in order to make it..."

McGrew: "The thrust of the Amendment removes, number one, removes the exemption. I think the confusion starts here that the Bill exempts persons and districts from the tort immunity. I am removing that exemption for the Fire Protection District itself and leaving the exemption for the trustees individually."

Leinenweber: "Okay, the Amendment is the Bill, is that right?"

McGrew: "Yeah, really."

Leinenweber: "I mean it is. You struck everything that... all of the additional language, is that right?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anything further?"

McGrew: "Yes, that's correct."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. McGrew, to close."

McGrew: "I would move for it's adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's 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's adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "On Third Reading appears 691, Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Did we move this back to Third Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, Third Reading."

McGrew: "Okay, thank you. House Bill 691 is very simple in it's task. All it does is allow school districts to use their 'five mil' for fire safety, to use that for energy conservation measures once they have met the Fire Safety Code. I would answer any questions. If none, I'd move for its passage."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment..."

McGrew: "No, no, final passage."

Speaker Redmond: "691? I thought you wanted that one returned to the Order of Second Reading?"

McGrew: "No, no, just 1740."



Speaker Redmond: "My notes are wrong then. The question is, shall this Bill pass. Representative D.L. Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "We got a little confused there, Mr. Speaker. We were on House Bill 1740, the Amendment was adopted, then what did he do with the Bill? Leave it on Second Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading."

D. Houlihan: "And now he is..."

Speaker Redmond: "I thought he wanted 691 returned to the Order of Second for an Amendment and that's the reason I went to that order. I was in error. He didn't want to return to the Order of Second and I thought as long as it was there, we'd see if he wanted to pass it."

D. Houlihan: "May we ask then if he is going to proceed on 693 that he, if he would give us the courtesy to reexplain the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "What was that again?"

D. Houlihan: "If he'd do us the courtesy of reexplaining the Bill. We thought in part that he was..."

Speaker Redmond: "691."

McGrew: "Yes, I'd be very happy to do that."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 691. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 691 provides that a school district may use their 'five mil' fire protection levy for energy conservation once they have met the Fire Safety Code standards. In other words, they could continue to levy the tax to provide for energy consumption or to provide for energy conservation matters. It is not a new tax."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Wikoff: "I think you've answered my question, Sam, but this is not removing the present Act that's using it for conservation methods. The state has a habit of changing these Fire Safety Codes from year to year. Would there be any provision in there that the Fire



Safety Code requirements would receive a number one priority? In other words, say they'd started on something with a conservation method and the state comes back as quite often they do and throw some fire safety requirements on them. What situation they going to be in at that time?"

McGrew: "Well, simply they must meet all Fire Safety Code standards first. If there are any changes from the Fire Marshall's office going back to the school districts, saying you are in violation of either the law or a particular regulation, the school districts must use that levy first to comply with whatever the new rules and regulations would be. That must be 100% completed before they use it for energy conservation."

Wikoff: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I see House Bill 691, it would permit local school districts to use their fire prevention and safety tax to alter or reconstruct any school building or equipment in order to conserve energy, but I believe they would also... I believe that the voters approve this tax and I'm asking the Sponsor of this legislation, will the referendum provision as far as the increase from 5 to 10% appear to the voters as far as a change in the, one, the way the tax was initially, the purpose of the tax when it initially was passed; and secondly, for the increase from 5 to 10%?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Well, I'm sorry, perhaps I misunderstood the question. Now, I am not increasing that levy from 5 to 10%."

Lechowicz: "Yeah, but that's the only time the voters will actually take a look at this situation. It exceeded .05% per year, is that correct?"

McGrew: "Yeah, if they, by referendum, have... raise that limit, yes."

Lechowicz: "And it says this may be increased up to 10% upon approval of the majority of the electors voting on such a proposition. My question is..."

McGrew: "...that's not new language, Sir."

Lechowicz: "Pardon me?"



McGrew: "That is not new language."

Lechowicz: "Yeah, but the purpose of this is new. I was wondering if you... does this affect the Chicago Board of Education?"

McGrew: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you."

Lechowicz: "Does this Bill affect the Chicago Board of Education? I didn't hear your response."

McGrew: "I do not know precisely."

Lechowicz: "Would you mind taking it out of the record for a while?"

McGrew: "Certainly."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, take it out of the record. We'd better go back where we belong. 1741. 1741."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1741. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to control and maintenance of and the purchase of land in construction of necessary buildings for public graveyards. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill would raise the pay for, the permissible pay for trustees in cemetery districts from one hundred dollars to a total of five hundred dollars. It does not raise their pay. It just raises the permissible limit that may be set by the, by the Board of Town Auditors for their pay so that in those townships where there are, where there is considerable population or several cemeteries and they have annual or have monthly meetings and have quite a bit of work to do, have to oversee all of the work of these various cemeteries, that they would be able to raise their pay up to a limit the same as the limit that is now allowed for fire district trustees. It is permissible only. It can remain at the one hundred dollars or can be raised to five hundred in accordance with what the Board of Town Auditors determines."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 139 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional



Majority is hereby declared passed. 1781."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1781. A Bill for an Act to create Sanitary Districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matejek. Out of the record. 1804."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1804. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to coroners. Third Reading of the Bill."

Mudd: "Yes, Representative... Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill is in relation to the Coroner's Act, passed out of the Counties and Townships Committee unanimously and what it does simply is it states that the inquest and investigation must be held in the county where the accident occurs. This Bill was placed in the House this year, in Committee because we have very difficult situations which come about by our large trauma centers and large communities which have big hospitals. We have an accident which occur outside of the counties in which these hospitals are located and the coroner in that particular county has to perform all the investigations that are relative to those accidents. And I think that the responsibility for the investigation of those accidents is, should lie within the county where they occur. And this is what this legislation tries to set up is that it states the responsibility to each county where the accident occurred and states that the investigation must be held there rather than in the hospital or county where the victim dies. If there any questions, I'll be glad to answer them. Otherwise, I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Simms: "Representative Mudd, if your Bill is to... were to pass, is it not true that we would still be paying, under legislation that Representative Deavers passed last Session, that counties that have a trauma center in them would still receive an extra five thousand dollars from the state for providing that extra service? Would that five thousand... do you address yourself to that problem of the extra money being paid to trauma center counties?"



Mudd: "Are you saying that we pay five thousand dollars for coroner's services in those counties where they have a trauma center?"

Simms: "Yes, that was Representative Deavers' Bill. Last Session, the Legislation in those counties that do have a trauma center in that they can receive five thousand dollars extra from the state to handle those additional coroner's duties. Does your Bill repeal that extra proviso, the extra money?"

Mudd: "No, Sir. But I think that if we have a trauma center located where... in a county that is receiving the money, we know that the coroner in that particular county is going to be aiding and supplying different types of information to the coroner outside of that area that he has at his access. Medical references that are obtained through that trauma center made available to him and pass on to the coroner outside."

Simms: "Well, I don't think that's exactly how the legislation works. Last Session of the Legislature, that those counties that have a trauma center shall receive an extra five thousand dollars to handle this type of provision. And I think your legislation has merit to it and that's where it should be addressed. But those counties that continue to have the trauma center and will receive that extra five thousand dollars and..."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "May I have leave to return this Bill to Second Reading and leave it there for the purposes of an Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, 1804 returned to the Order of Second Reading. 1918, Representative Giglio. Out of the record. 1929, Representative Pechous."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1929. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pechous."

Pechous: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll attempt to be brief because 1929 itself is brief. It adds a Section to the Counties Act. It would authorize County Boards to regulate taxicabs in the unincorporated areas of the county. The



Bill was heard before the County and Township Committee that received a 14 to 2 vote do pass. I submit it for your favorable approval. I would respond to any questions should there be any."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will. Representative Pechous."

Kane: "Why do taxicabs need to be regulated?"

Pechous: "Well, being a Cook County native, I would simply point out that we have many members of our mobile society that would land at O'Hare and be asking for transfers to portions within Cook County that presently are unincorporated. Therefore, are not regulated by taxicab fares, no other controls which are present, say, in my community of Berwyn."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor... Representative Mahar."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mahar: "Representative Pechous, aren't they already regulated in the municipality where they received their license?"

Pechous: "That is correct and also the... not only regulated by the, the fare that can be charged but also tested as to accuracy of the speedometer and the pull-down, the flag charge and the mileage."

Mahar: "Would this give the county authority to put an additional license on the cab in addition to the one they have in municipalities?"

Pechous: "It would provide the County Board the permissive authorization to provide then for the regulation, yes, and licensing of taxicabs within the unincorporated portions of their respective counties."

Mahar: "In other words, if a cab picked up a fare in a village or a city and delivered that fare into the unincorporated area, in order to do that, they would become regulated by the county, have to have a license in the county and comply with all the county regulations that might be enacted. Is this correct?"

Pechous: "Generally, I would have to accede to that statement, yes."

Mahar: "Well, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."



Mahar: "I'd like to speak to the Bill. It just seems to me, I'm not aware of any particular situation. I know in my district we have a sizeable amount of unincorporated area and I know that the cabs frequent those areas delivering passengers from the train stations and from the airport and whatever. It just seems to me it's an additional burden on them to require them to have to pay an additional tax, license fee and become regulated on additional basis other than the municipality. It seems to me the municipality would lose their control in the license of these vehicles where most of the action takes place and I question the advisability of this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pechous, to close."

Pechous: "In closing, I would ask for..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff, pardon me."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Sponsor please."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Huff: "Well, Representative Pechous, isn't it also true that a cab having established a flat rate from the municipality where he picks up his fare goes into the unincorporated areas and it also is true that that cab is prohibited from picking up any fare out of that area?"

Pechous: "There seems to me changing rules and standards in regards to that. What this Bill would do is..."

Huff: "Well, no... All right, well, that's been... I drove a cab for six years and it was always the practice then and I think it still stands today. If I may address myself to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Huff: "I'll agree with Mr. Mahar. I think that this is just added duplicity and we just don't need it. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pechous, to close."

Pechous: "Yes, we find that our society is a constantly a mobile society. Many people relying on taxicabs. Our commuters would be deplaning at O'Hare or Meigs' Field and or O'Hare and these people need some assurance that when they travel from one point to another that there's not some mumbo-jumbo involved that there is a standardization of fare and that is under some measure of regulation by the



County Board if they deem it to be of their best interest. And it is permissive. I again remind you that it was properly aired before the Counties and Township Committee. It did receive a favorable vote. I ask you to give a green light in favorable response to 1929 and I'd appreciate that very much. 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? Representative Pechous."

Pechous: "Further explanation of my vote. And as an inducement for those buttons that have not yet registered the green light, I would remind you that we have a responsibility to those motorists, those tourists, those friends and neighbors, those people throughout the State of Illinois that would land, for instance, at O'Hare, one of the busiest airports in the world that they would have the assurance that given the transit from O'Hare to portions of Cook County and elsewhere through the State of Illinois that they would be met with some regulation that they could understand, that they would not be treated on a basis unlike that which would be met by a member of that particular county. And for those several reasons, I would ask respectfully for a favorable response and a green light on 1929."

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

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I was wondering if the Gentleman might just nod one way or the other. This is his first Bill. If it is, I... he has to be complimented on doing the job he's done here this evening with the piece of legislation and we certainly ought to give him a hand in passing. I don't think it's going to be a piece of legislation that's going to be detrimental to anybody in the State of Illinois. And he's certainly trying to help the cab, the people who ride the cabs. I think we ought to give him a vote."

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

Pechous: "Yes, I would ask that this Bill be placed on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman requests it be placed on Postponed



Consideration. 2190."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2190. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill which allows... which is at the request of the Department of Insurance. It allows the Department of Insurance to examine those insurance policies which it thinks it should examine. Presently the law insists that all policies must be filed with them and must be retained by them. They now have a storage problem, simply a huge mass of papers which they no... they have no desire to look at. This is certainly optional. They can select and pick and choose the Bills which they desire to look at and it's something which will certainly serve a purpose we're all seeking - do away with some of the paperwork. And I would solicit a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question 144 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2244."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2244. A Bill for an Act to recreate the Illinois Commission on Labor Laws. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2244 merely recreates a Commission that has been operating for the past eight years composed of Members on both sides of the aisle and both the Senate and House. I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Matijevec."

Matijevec: "Speaker, on that last Bill I hit the wrong button. Could I have leave to be recorded 'no' on 2240?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman."

Matijevec: "You can join me if you want, Bill. Take a look at the Bill. I'll let you if you'll let me."

Speaker Redmond: "All right, the Gentleman has asked leave..."



Matijevich: "If you ask leave, I'll let you. All right."

Speaker Redmond: "Objections have been raised."

Matijevich: "All right, I'll move to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 2240 passed."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we're on 2244. I'll get back to you, Representative Matijevich. On 2244 the question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? All voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'aye', 119 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2282. Then I'll be back to you."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2282. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Park District Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, 2280 is a Bill which would allow park districts to award contracts up to five thousand without going to competitive bids. I ask for your favorable support."

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

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Isn't it true that the limitation for noncompetitive bidding for other units of local government and school districts is twenty-five hundred?"

Tuerk: "It's now twenty-five hundred for the park districts. What this Bill is attempting to do is increase that level."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, earlier today we amended an Act increasing from fifteen hundred to twenty-five hundred dollar the maximum amount by which a unit of local government could enter into a contract without competitive bidding. Twenty-five hundred dollars is the standard by which all units of government can enter into contracts without competitive bidding. Now, we have the park district asking to go to five thousand dollars, double the authority of other units. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that we stay at the twenty-five



hundred dollars which was approved earlier today for another unit of government. We stay at the twenty-five hundred dollars which was recently attained by other units of government. If we go for five thousand for park districts, then we might as well amend this Bill and grant that to all other units of government. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that the whole idea behind competitive bidding is to keep down the cost of government, particularly as in this case, local government. No justification has been given for this. It's extraordinary authority. I don't think park districts are any different library districts, municipalities, school boards, et cetera. And I respectfully suggest a 'no' vote on House Bill 2282."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "No, I'm still waiting for that other motion to reconsider, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Further discussion? Representative Tuerk, to close."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, when I served on the park board back in Peoria back fifteen years ago, the competitive bidding limitation was at that level of twenty-five hundred dollars. I don't need to remind you what has happened during that interim period relative to the crunch on local units of government minus the municipalities and the counties who do participate in the income tax revenues. Now, the park districts and other units of local government don't and as a result, the cost of administering government has risen to a great extent. It's been fifteen years that I'm aware of and possibly longer since any change has been made. During the meantime, inflation has set in. If you people want to continue the additional cost of government at your local level, this is a good way. Now, I submit to you when Representative Schlickman said it should remain at twenty-five hundred, I might remind him that municipalities can by two-thirds vote of the council or the village board, eliminate any competitive bidding process. Then I say at least we have some safeguards in this piece of legislation and I think it's high time that we give the park districts an additional twenty-five hundred dollars in which to operate. It would cut down the



costs, administrative costs of putting a lot things out to competitive bids and it would help those park districts a great deal. I would ask for your favorable support."

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

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we should be raising these limits. I think competition would keep the price of government down and I believe this is a bad idea whose time has not yet arrived and recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 48 'aye' and 67 'no'. Having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. About ready to wind down here now. 1036 on Third Reading. Representative Robinson. 1036. It's on Postponed Consideration. 1036. Well, that was declared lost. You're not listening. Pay attention. 1036."

Robinson: "May I have leave to bring 1036 to Second Reading?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman have leave to return 1036? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Where is 1036?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's on Postponed Consideration."

Schlickman: "On the Calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "We just voted it a few minutes ago. Second supplemental."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if you're going to go the Order of Consideration Postponed by the rules, you're required to start with House Bill 79."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, okay. Any announcements? Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, I want to revert back to the motion. Having voted on the prevailing side by which House Bill 2190 passed, I would like to reconsider that vote. I happened to hit the wrong switch. I think it's a bad Bill. We give the Director of the Department of Insurance too much power, rules and regulations that



we shouldn't give. And I think that..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton on the floor? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. We're not at the Order of Motions."

Matijeich: "No, it's too late. He already recognized me."

Schlickman: "And I ask that motion be reduced to writing and placed on the Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "All right, Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "I move that motion lie on the table."

Speaker Redmond: "Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I remove my objection to unanimous consent that the Gentleman be permitted to vote 'yes' on the Bill."

Matijeich: "Okay, thank you. That's all I wanted. I just asked for myself, not you, Bill. I want to be recorded as voting 'no', Mr. Speaker, on 2190."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to be recorded as voting 'no' on 2190? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Any announcements? Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last week I had four Bills that should have been referred back to Appropriations Committee for some reason. Two of them still didn't go back. House Bill 1099 and House Bill 2001 have been in the Substantive Committee, but should have been referred to Appropriations I and I ask leave that those two Bills be referred to Appropriations I."

Speaker Redmond: "Just a moment, the Clerk is conferring." Now, Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "1099 and 2001, by our House rules, should have been referred to Appropriations I and evidently someone slipped up and put out on the Calendar where they don't belong."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what he's referring to, but 1099 is on the call for tomorrow morning at eight a.m."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Yeah, that's why I'm doing it, Tom. I asked leave last



week that they be referred to our Committee and evidently somebody goofed up and put them on the Calendar here yet. They, I did get leave last week but somehow they're back on the Calendar.

You'll be heard tomorrow because I really did get leave last week."

McMaster: "Well, John, that's what I'm asking, I guess if I'm going to be heard tomorrow."

Matijevich: "All right, yes."

McMaster: "Thank you."

Matijevich: "But I wanted to make it official, that's all."

Speaker Redmond: "Further announcements? Representative Cunningham, for an announcement. Your clock is three minutes off, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "I'm working on that, Mr. Speaker. Republican Members of Appropriations I are reminded there'll be a game plan rehearsal at 7:30 in the morning, Room 220, Continental breakfast will be furnished. Please attend."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, I'd like leave to be recorded as voting 'aye' on both House Bills 571 and 1626."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Lady have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Daniels, are you seeking recognition?"

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. House Bills 855, 856 and 857 show up on the Consent Calendar, Second Reading. Those Bills were not to be reported out of Exec. Committee as do pass and there must have been an error by the Clerk. I agreed with Representative Bradley on the other side... that's the fateful night that you killed me, Mike. I agreed with Representative Bradley that I would hold those Bills, they'd be placed in Subcommittee because it was dealing with the alien ownership rights that he had brought up earlier. So those Bills by error were reported out should be referred back to Exec. and then put in Subcommittee. And with leave of the House, I would so move."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce." Representative Daniels. Wait a minute. Representative Daniels, I guess..."

Daniels: "I wanted to with leave of the House put 855, 856 and 857 back



in Exec. Committee and refer it to Subcommittee, dealing with the alien rights as I agreed to do with Representative Bradley."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any objections?"

Daniels: "I guess we'll put them in interim study Exec. Committee if that's all right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "I think the Bill that you're referring to that I have, I think that that's... that Bill went to an interim study, Dan, if that's... or leave... is that what you're trying to do with your Bills? Just so we get them in the same place."

Daniels: "Yeah, which Committee is it in?"

Bradley: "Judiciary, the Committee that you're a Member of."

Daniels: "I would ask that 855, 856 and 857 be referred back to the Committee on Assignments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Just a reminder, the Appropriations I and the Appropriations II Committee will be meeting promptly at eight a.m. in the normal meeting room. That's eight a.m. for Appropriations I and Appropriations II."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce, have you..."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, in case anyone cares, the House Revenue Committee will not meet tomorrow or this week. In fact, I don't even feel like meeting next week."

Speaker Redmond: "Does Representative Maragos know that? Anything further? Any further announcements? Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As the Sponsor of 383, I would ask permission to table that Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Anything further? Representative Madigan. Mr. Clerk, do you have a program for tonight?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, nothing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Are there any further announcements, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any further announcements? Guess not."



Madigan: "There being no further announcements, I move that we adjourn until twelve o'clock tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the motion. The question is on the motion. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion is carried. We moved about 74 Bills today and 990 to go."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1.			
1	12:00	Speaker Redmond	House to order
1		Reverend Krueger	Prayer
1		Speaker Redmond	Roll Call
1		Clerk O'Brien	Reading of Journal
1		Speaker Redmond	
1		Madigan	Move to dispense
2		Speaker Redmond	
2		Madigan	Excused absence
2		Speaker Redmond	
2		Ryan	Excused absence
2		Speaker Redmond	
3		Clerk O'Brien	HB 75-Third Reading
3		Speaker Redmond	
3	12:07	Skinner	
3		Speaker Redmond	
3		Kelly)	
)	
4		Skinner)	Questions
4		Speaker Redmond	
4	12:10	Schoberlein	Question
5		Skinner	
5		Speaker Redmond	
5		Matijevich)	
)	
5		Skinner)	Questions
5		Speaker Redmond	
5		McMaster)	
)	
5		Skinner)	
5		Speaker Redmond	



2.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
5		McMaster)	
5		Skinner)	Questions
6		McMaster	Speaks to the Bill
6		Speaker Redmond	
6		Kempiners)	
6		Speaker Redmond)	
7		Skinner	Out of the record
7	12:16	Speaker Redmond	
7		Clerk O'Brien	HB 96 - Third Reading
7		Lucco	
7		Speaker Redmond	
7		Ryan)	
7		Lucco)	
8	12:19	Clerk O'Brien	HB-1072 - Third Reading
8		Speaker Redmond	
8		Ebbesen	
8		Speaker Redmond	
8		Simms)	
9		Ebbesen)	
9		Speaker Redmond	
9		Madigan	Support
10		Speaker Redmond	
10	12:25	Skinner	
10		Speaker Redmond	
10		Giorgi)	
11		Ebbesen)	Questions



3.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	11		Speaker Redmond	
	11		Ebbesen	Responds
	11		McMasters	Against
	12		Speaker Redmond	
	12	12:28	Ebbesen	Out of the record
	12		Speaker Redmond	
	12		Clerk O'Brien	HB 261 - Third Reading
	12		Speaker Redmond	
	12		Polk	
	12		Speaker Redmond	
	13		Houlihan)	
)	Questions
	13		Polk)	
	13		Speaker Redmond	Passed
	13		Clerk O'Brien	HB 281 - Third Reading
	13	12:30	Polk	
	13		Speaker Redmond	
	14		Geo-Karis)	
)	
	14		Polk)	
	14		Speaker Redmond	
	14		Conti)	
)	
	14		Polk)	
	14		Speaker Redmond	HB 281 - passed
	14		Clerk O'Brien	HB 471 - Third Reading
	14		Stuffle	Leave to hear HB 471-472-473
	14		Speaker Redmond	
	14		Ryan	Objects
	14	12:35	Stuffle	HB 471 - continues



4.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	15		Speaker Redmond	Passed
	15		Clerk O'Brien	HB 472-Third Reading
	15		Speaker Redmond	
	15		Stuffle	
	15		Speaker Redmond	
	15		Johnson)	
)	
	15		Stuffle)	
	15	12:37	Speaker Redmond	Passed
	16		Clerk O'Brien	HB 473-Third Reading
	16		Speaker Redmond	
	16		Stuffle	
	16		Speaker Redmond	
	16		Keats)	
)	
	17		Stuffle)	
	17		Speaker Redmond	Passed
	17	12:40	Clerk O'Brien	HB 480-Third Reading
	17		Speaker Redmond	
	17		Deuster	Leave to return to Second
	17		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted
	17		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #4
	17		Speaker Redmond	
	17		Kelly	
	18		Speaker Redmond	
	18	12:42	Deuster	
	18		Speaker Redmond	
	18		Barnes)	
)	Questions
	18		Kelly)	



5.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	19		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #4 adopted
	19		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #5
	19		Speaker Redmond	
	19	12:44	Kelly	
	19		Speaker Redmond	
	19		Deuster	Oppose
	20		Speaker Redmond	
	20		Porter	Urges 'no' vote
	21		Speaker Redmond	
	21		Kelly	To close
	21		Speaker Redmond	
	22		Deuster	
	22		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #5 adopted
	22		Kelly	
	22		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
	22	12:52	Bennett	HB 507
	23		Speaker Redmond	
	23		Clerk O'Brien	HB 507 - 3rd Reading
	23		Speaker Redmond	
	23		Houlihan, D. L.)	
	23		Bennett)	
	23		Speaker Redmond	Out of the record
	23		Clerk O'Brien	HB 557
	23	12:55	Davis, J.	
	24		Speaker Redmond	
	24		Barnes, G.)	
	24		Davis, J.)	



6.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
24		Speaker Redmond	
24		Geo-Karis	
25		Speaker Redmond	
25		Davis, J.	
25		Speaker Redmond	HB 1020 to 2nd
25	1:00	Edgar	Amendment #2
25		Speaker Redmond	
25		Skinner)	
25		Edgar)	Question
26		Speaker Redmond	
26		Edgar	Out of the record
26	1:05	Speaker Redmond	
26		Satterthwaite	HB 684-leave to return to 2nd
26		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted
26		Satterthwaite	
26		Speaker Redmond	
26		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3
26		Speaker Redmond	
27		Levin	
27		Speaker Redmond	
27		Satterthwaite	Agree
27		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #3 adopted-3rd Reading
27		Steele	HB 675-leave to return to 2nd
27		Speaker Redmond	
27		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
27	1:07	Steele	
28		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted-3rd Reading



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
7.			
28		Mudd	Leave to return HB 644 to 2nd
28		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted
28		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
28		Speaker Redmond	
28		Houlihan, D. L.	Asks to be held on 2nd
28		Speaker Redmond	HB 544
28		Murphy	Explains
28		Speaker Redmond	
28		Lucco	Introduction
29		Speaker Redmond	
29		Murphy	Continues
29		Speaker Redmond	
29		Johnson	
29		Speaker Redmond	Take out, machine broken
29		McClain	HB 701 back to 2nd
29		Speaker Redmond	
29		McClain	Amendment #1
29		Speaker Redmond	
29		Schlickman)	
30		McClain)	
30		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
30		Epton	HB 1489 return to 2nd-Amend #1
31		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted-3rd Reading
31		Rigney	
31		Speaker Redmond	
31		Schlickman	Introduces Walsh
31		Speaker Redmond	Amendment Adopted-3rd Reading



8.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
31		Mautino)	HB 42
32		Speaker Redmond)	
32		Mautino	Out of the record
32		Speaker Redmond	
32		Meyer	HB 802 - Amendment #1
32		Speaker Redmond	Adopted. Third Reading
32		Meyer	Move to table HB 807
32		Speaker Redmond	Tabled
32		Waddell	Introduction
33		Speaker Redmond	
33		Deuster	
33		Speaker Redmond	
33		Edgar	Amendment
33		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted-3rd Reading
33		Clerk O'Brien	Agreed Resolutions
33		Speaker Redmond	
33		Matijevich	
33	1:25	Speaker Redmond	Consent Calendar-2nd R-2nd Day
34		Clerk O'Brien	
34		Speaker Redmond	
34		Madigan	Question
34		Speaker Redmond	
34		Ryan)	
35		Clerk O'Brien)	
35		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading
35		Kane	Leave to return to 2nd-HB 809
35		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
9.			
35		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
35		Kane	
35		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted-3rd Reading
35		Clerk O'Brien	HB 544-3rd Reading
35		Speaker Redmond	
35	1:30	Murphy	
36		Speaker Redmond	
36		Johnson	
37		Speaker Redmond	
37	1:32	Schoberlein	Support
38		Speaker Redmond	
38		Kempiners	Support
39		Speaker Redmond	
39		Epton	Against
40		Speaker Redmond	
40		Murphy	To close
40		Speaker Redmond	
40		Cunningham	
40		Speaker Redmond	HB 544 - passed
41		Clerk O'Brien	HB 557-3rd Reading
41		Speaker Redmond	
41		Davis, J.	To close
41		Speaker Redmond	Passed
41		Clerk O'Brien	HB 571-3rd Reading
41		Speaker Redmond	
41	1:45	Byers	
41		Speaker Redmond	



10.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
41		Brady	
42		Speaker Redmond	
42		Schlickman	
42		Speaker Redmond	HB 571 - passed
42		John Hall	HB 584 - 3rd Reading
42		Speaker Redmond	
42		Rigney	
42		Speaker Redmond	
43		Wolf)	
)	
43		Rigney)	
43		Speaker Redmond	Passed
43		John Hall	HB 609 - 3rd Reading
43		Speaker Redmond	
43		Totten	
43	1:48	Speaker Redmond	Passed
44		Clerk Hall	HB 594 - 3rd Reading
44		Speaker Redmond	
44		Schlickman	
44		Speaker Redmond	Passed.
44		Clerk Hall	HB 650 - 3rd Reading
44		Speaker Redmond	
44		Richmond	
45		Speaker Redmond	
45		Bowman)	
)	
45	1:51	Richmond)	
45		Speaker Redmond	Passed
45		Clerk Hall	HB 601-3rd Reading



11.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
45		Speaker Redmond	
45		Yourell	
45		Speaker Redmond	
46		Waddell)	
)	
46		Yourell)	
46		Speaker Redmond	Passed
46		Clerk Hall	HB 602-3rd Reading
46		Speaker Redmond	
46	1:55	Yourell	
46		Speaker Redmond	
46		Dunn, J)	
)	
46		Yourell)	
47		Speaker Redmond	
47		Ewing	
47		Speaker Redmond	
47		Houlihan, D. L.)	
)	
47		Yourell)	
47		Speaker Redmond	
47		Geo-Karis)	
)	
47		Yourell)	
48		Speaker Redmond	
48		Yourell	To close
48		Speaker Redmond	
48	1:57	Yourell	Explains Bill
48		Speaker Redmond	
48		McMaster	



12.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
48		Speaker Redmond	
48		Skinner	Question
48		Speaker Redmond	
49		Yourell	
49		Speaker Redmond	Passed
49	2:01	Yourell	HB 603 - Third Reading
49		Speaker Redmond	
49		Skinner)	
)	
50		Yourell)	
50		Speaker Redmond	
50		Houlihan, D. L.)	
)	
50		Speaker Redmond)	
51		Yourell	
50		Speaker Redmond	Passed
50		Clerk Hall	HB 604 - 3rd Reading
50		Speaker Redmond	
50		Yourell	
50		Speaker Redmond	
51		Totten)	
)	
51	2:05	Yourell)	
51		Speaker Redmond	
51		McMaster	
51		Speaker Redmond	
51		Ewing	
51		Speaker Redmond	Passed
51		Clerk O'Brien	HB 605 - 3rd Reading



13.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
51		Speaker Redmond	
51		Yourell	
52		Speaker Redmond	
52		Houlihan, D. L.)	
)	
52		Yourell)	
52		Speaker Redmond)	
52		Pullen)	
)	
52	2:07	Yourell)	
52		Speaker Redmond	
52		McMaster	Explains 'aye' vote
53		Speaker Redmond	
53		Greisheimer	Against
53		Speaker Redmond	
53		Dunn, R.	Support
54		Speaker Redmond	
54		Anderson	
54		Speaker Redmond	
54		Skinner	Against
55		Speaker Redmond	
55		Ewing	Verification if passed
55		Speaker Redmond	
55		Yourell	Polls absentees
55		Speaker Redmond	
55		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
55		Speaker Redmond	Vote Collins 'no'
55		Bluthardt	'Aye'
55		Speaker Redmond	Bartulis 'aye'



14.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
55		Clerk O'Brien	92 'ayes' 66 'nays'
55		Speaker Redmond	
55	2:16	Ewing	People in seats
55		Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative Roll Call
55		Speaker Redmond	
56		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
56		Speaker Redmond	Barnes 'aye'
56		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
56		Houlihan, J.	Change to 'aye'
56		Speaker Redmond	
56	2:20	Clerk O'Brien	Continues
56		Speaker Redmond	
56		Houlihan, J.	Permission to be verified
56		Speaker Redmond	
57, 58		Ewing)	Questions Affirmative Roll Call
)	
		Speaker Redmond)	
		Clerk O'Brien)	
58		Speaker Redmond	Passed
58		Clerk O'Brien	HB 421 - 3rd Reading
58		Speaker Redmond	
58	2:26	Yourell	
58		Speaker Redmond	
59		Clerk O'Brien	HB 623
59		Speaker Redmond	
59		Byers	
60		Speaker Bradley	
60		J. Dunn)	
		Byers)	



15.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
60		J. Dunn	Speaks to Bill
61		Speaker Bradley	
61		Byers	To close
61		Speaker Bradley	
61		Holewinski	Supports
62		Speaker Bradley	
62		Geo-Karis	Support
62		Speaker Bradley	
62		McMaster	Oppose
62		Speaker Bradley	
62		Pullen	Oppose
63		Speaker Bradley	
63		Polk	Support
63		Speaker Bradley	Passed
63		Clerk O'Brien	HB 184 - 3rd Reading
64		Speaker Bradley	
64	2:40	Williams	Sponsor
65		Speaker Bradley	
65		Steele	
66		Speaker Bradley	
66		Flinn	Oppose
67		Speaker Bradley	
67		Mahar	Support
67		Speaker Bradley	
67		Griesheimer)	
)	
68		Williams)	
68		Speaker Bradley	



16. <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
68		L. Martin)	
)	
69		Williams)	
70		Speaker Bradley	
70		Campbell	Oppose
70		Speaker Bradley	
70		Reed	Support
70		Speaker Bradley	
70		Macdonald	Support
71		Speaker Bradley	
71		Williams	To close
71		Speaker Bradley	
71		Steele	Oppose
71		Speaker Bradley	
72		J. Dunn	
72		Speaker Bradley	
72	3:02	Williams	
73		Speaker Bradley	
73		Taylor	Explains vote
74		Speaker Bradley	
74	3:06	Hoffman	Explains vote
74		Speaker Bradley	
74		Conti	Explains 'no' vote
74		Speaker Bradley	
74		Jacobs	Explains vote
75		Speaker Bradley	
75		Williams	Polls absentees
75		Speaker Bradley	



17.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
75		Campbell	Verification if passes
75		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
75		Speaker Bradley	
75		Beatty	'aye'
75		Speaker Bradley	
76		Clerk O'Brien	Reads affirmative roll call
76		Speaker Bradley	
76		Gaines	Vote 'aye'
76		Speaker Bradley	
76		McCrew	Votes 'aye'
76		Speaker Bradley	
76		Von Boeckman	'aye'
76		Speaker Bradley	
76		Caldwell	Change to 'aye'
76		Speaker Bradley	
76		Byers	Votes 'present'
77		Speaker Bradley	
77	3:18	Deuster	Votes 'aye'
77		Clerk O'Brien	
77		Speaker Bradley	94 'ayes'
77		McAuliffe	'aye'
77		Speaker Bradley	95 'ayes'
77		Campbell) Questions Affirmative Roll Call))
78		Clerk O'Brien	
78		Speaker Bradley	
78		Telcser	Requests to be verified
79		Campbell	



18.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
79	3:25	Speaker Bradley	91 'ayes' 53 'nays' passed
79		Clerk O'Brien	HB 199 - Third Reading
79		Speaker Bradley	
79		Leinenweber	
80		Speaker Bradley	
80		Getty	
80		Speaker Bradley	Passed
80		Clerk O'Brien	HB 385 - Third Reading
80		Speaker Bradley	
80	3:29	Richmond	
81		Speaker Bradley	
81		Geo-Karis)	
)	
81		Richmond)	
81		Speaker Bradley	
81		Richmond	To close
81		Speaker Bradley	Passed
81	3:32	Clerk O'Brien	HB 703 - Third Reading
82		Rigney	
82		Speaker Bradley	703 passed
82		Clerk O'Brien	HB 735 - Third Reading
82		Speaker Bradley	
82		Sevcik	Explains 735
82		Speaker Bradley	HB 735 passed
83		Clerk O'Brien	741 - HB
83		Speaker Bradley	
83		Mudd	Explains HB 741
83		Speaker Bradley	HB 741 passed



19.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
83		Clerk O'Brien	HB 780
83		Speaker Bradley	
83		Pierce	Explains HB 780
84		Speaker Bradley	
84		Skinner	Explains vote
84		Speaker Bradley	HB 780 passes
84		Clerk O'Brien	HB 750
84		Speaker Bradley	
84		Ryan	Explains HB 750
85		Speaker Bradley	
85		Cunningham	Explains his vote
85		Speaker Bradley	HB 750 passes
85		Clerk O'Brien	Reads HB 770
85		Speaker Bradley	
85		Friedrich	HB 770 - explanation
86		Speaker Bradley	
86		Matijeovich	
86		Speaker Bradley	
86		Hanahan	
87		Speaker Bradley	
87		Keats)	
)	
88		Speaker Bradley)	
)	
88		Ryan)	
88		Speaker Bradley	
88		Darrow	Speaks on HB 770
89		Speaker Bradley	
90		Barnes	



20.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
91		Speaker Bradley	
91		Winchester	Moves previous question
91		Speaker Bradley	
91		Friedrich	To close
92		Speaker Bradley	
92		Tipsword	Explains vote
93		Speaker Bradley	
93		Steele	Explains vote
93		Speaker Bradley	
93		Griesheimer	Explains vote
94		Speaker Bradley	
94		Friedrich	Explains vote
94		Speaker Bradley	HB 770 passed
94		Clerk O'Brien	HB 803
95		Speaker Bradley	
95		Hart	Explains HB 803
95		Speaker Bradley	HB 803 passed
95		Clerk O'Brien	HB 822
95		Speaker Bradley	
95		Kelly	Explains HB 822
95		Speaker Bradley	
96		Clerk O'Brien	HB 898
96		Speaker Bradley	
96		Richmond	
96		Speaker Bradley	
96		Schlickman)	
)	
96		Richmond)	



21. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
97		Speaker Bradley)	
97		Walsh)	
97		Speaker Bradley	HB 898 out of the record
97		Speaker Bradley	HB 947
97		Clerk O'Brien	Reads HB 947
97		Speaker Bradley	
97		Hanahan	Explains HB 947-back on 2nd request
98		Speaker Bradley	HB 947 - back on 2nd
98		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Amendment #1
98		Speaker Bradley	
98		DiPrima	Moves adoption of Amendment #1
98		Speaker Bradley	
98		Conti	
98		Speaker Bradley	
98		Schlickman	Yield?
98		DiPrima	No
98		Speaker Bradley	
99		Hanahan)	
99		Schlickman)	
99		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #1 adopted-3rd Reading
99		Clerk O'Brien	Reads HB 950
99		Speaker Bradley	
99		Hanahan	Explains HB 950
100		Speaker Bradley	
100		Leinenweber)	Fiscal note?
101		Hanahan)	



22.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
101		Speaker Bradley	
)	
101		Willer)	
)	
102		Hanahan)	
102		Speaker Bradley	
103		Telcser)	
)	
103		Hanahan)	
104		Speaker Bradley	
104		Stuffle	Moves previous question
104		Speaker Bradley	
104		Hanahan	To close on HB 950
105		Speaker Bradley	
105		Simms	Explains 'no' vote
106		Speaker Bradley	
106		Hoffman	
106		Speaker Bradley	HB 950 fails
106		Clerk O'Brien	Reads HB 952
106		Speaker Bradley	
106		Hanahan	Explains HB 952
107		Speaker Bradley	
107		Willer)	Yield?
)	
107		Hanahan)	
108		Speaker Bradley	
108		Skinner	Supports
108		Speaker Bradley	
108		Schlickman)	
)	
108		Hanahan)	
108		Schlickman	Addresses Bill



23. <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
109		Speaker Bradley	
109		Conti)	
)	
109		Hanahan)	
110		Speaker Bradley	
110		Waddell)	
)	
110		Hanahan)	
111		Speaker Bradley	
111		Matijevich	Supports
111		Speaker Bradley	
111		Van Duyne)	
)	
112		Hanahan)	
112		Speaker Bradley	
112		Tuerk	Moves previous question
112		Speaker Bradley	
112		Hanahan	To close
113		Speaker Bradley	
113		Mugalian	
113		Speaker Bradley	
113		Rigney	
114		Speaker Bradley	Failed
114		Clerk O'Brien	HB 971
114		Speaker Bradley	
114		Taylor	Out of record
114		Speaker Bradley	
114		Clerk O'Brien	HB 974
114		Speaker Bradley	
114		Doyle	Sponsor



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
24.			
115		Speaker Bradley	Passed
115		Clerk O'Brien	HB 975
115		Speaker Bradley	Out of record
115		Porter	'aye' on last Bill
115		Speaker Bradley	
115		Bowman	'aye' on 770
115		Speaker Bradley	
115		Clerk O'Brien	HB 982
115		Speaker Bradley	
115		Neff	Sponsor
115		Speaker Bradley	
116		Matijevich	
116		Speaker Bradley	
116		Neff	To close
116		Speaker Bradley	
116		Speaker Redmond	Passed
116	4:55	Clerk O'Brien	HB 983 - Third Reading
116		Speaker Redmond	
116		Martin, L.	
117		Speaker Redmond	Passed
117		Clerk O'Brien	HB 984 - 3rd Reading
117		Speaker Redmond	
117		Ewing	
117		Speaker Redmond	Passed
118		Clerk O'Brien	HB 985 - Third Reading
118		Speaker Redmond	
118		Ewing	Hear all Amen 1. Roll Call



25.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
118		Speaker Redmond	
118		Clerk O'Brien	HB 986, 987
118		Speaker Redmond	
118		Ewing	
118		Speaker Redmond	Bills passed
118		Ewing	
118		Speaker Redmond	
118		Katz	
119		Speaker Redmond	
119		Clerk O'Brien	HB 990 - 3rd Reading
119		Tuerk	
119	5:03	Speaker Redmond	
119		Tuerk	
119		Speaker Redmond	Passed
119		Clerk O'Brien	HB 995 - 3rd Reading
119		Speaker Redmond	
119		Steczo	
120		Speaker Redmond	
120		Steczo)	
120)	
120		Leinenweber)	
120		Johnson	
120	5:07	Johnson	
121		Speaker Redmond	
121		Hoffman, G.	
121		Speaker Redmond	
121		Wikoff)	
121)	
121		Steczo)	



26.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
121		Speaker Redmond	
122		Bartulis)	
122	5:09	Steczo)	
122		Speaker Redmond	
122		Steczo	Out of record
122		Speaker Redmond	
122		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1001 - 3rd Reading
122		Speaker Redmond	
122		Leverenz	
122		Speaker Redmond	Passed
123		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1009 - 3rd Reading
123		Speaker Redmond	
123		Beatty	
123		Speaker Redmond	Passed
123		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1022 - 3rd Reading
123		Speaker Redmond	
123	5:13	Catania	
124		Speaker Redmond	
124		McClain)	
124	5:15	Catania)	
124		Speaker Redmond	
125		Schlickman)	
125		Catania)	
125		Speaker Redmond	
125		Van Duyne)	
126		Catania)	
127		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
127		Catania	To close
127		Speaker Redmond	
127		Cunningham	
127		Speaker Redmond	
127		Catania	
128		Speaker Redmond	Passed
128	5:24	Clerk O'Brien	HB-1026
128		Speaker Redmond	
128		Madigan	Recess
128		Speaker Redmond	
128		Mugalian	
129		Speaker Redmond	
129		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1028 - 3rd Reading
129		Speaker Redmond	
129		Madigan	
129		Speaker Redmond	
129		Skinner	Leav: to vote yes: on HB 985, 986, 987 HB 1028
129		Speaker Redmond	
129		Ryan	Question
129	5:28	Speaker Redmond	Passed
130		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1035 - 3rd Reading
130		Speaker Redmond	
130		Edgar	
130		Speaker Redmond	
130		Lechowicz)	
)	
130		Edgar)	



<u>28.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
130	5:30	Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	Consent Calendar - 3rd Reading
131		Speaker Redmond	
		Bennett	Leave etc.
		Speaker Redmond	
		Adams	Leave etc.
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	Leave, etc.
		Speaker Redmond	Bills passed
		Madigan	Move recess til 7:00
132		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	2-minute Perfunct
		Recess	
133		Speaker Redmond	House Bills - 3rd Reading -
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 1111
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	Out of the record
		Speaker Redmond	1187
134		Bradley)	Question
		Speaker Redmond)	
		Griesheimer	Question
135		Speaker Redmond	
		Mahar	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bradley	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Byers	



29. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
136		Speaker Redmond)	
		Houlihan, D.)	
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 1568
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, D.	Explains House Bill 1568
		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedland	Supports
137		Speaker Redmond	House Bill 1568 passed; 698
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 698
		Griesheimer	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, D.	Question
		Greisheimer	Response
		Speaker Redmond	
138		Houlihan, D.	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hart	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Birchler	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Griesheimer)	
139		Birchler)	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Beatty)	
		Speaker Redmond)	
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 668
	Speaker Redmond		



<u>30.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Terzich	
		Speaker Redmond	House Bill 668 passed; 669
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 669
		Speaker Redmond	
		Breslin	
		Speaker Redmond	
140		Terzich	
		Speaker Redmond	
141		Houlihan, D.)	Question
)	
		Terzich)	Response
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 671
		Speaker Redmond	
		Terzich	House Bill 669
		Speaker Redmond	
		Darrow)	Question
)	
		Terzich)	Response
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 1094
142		Speaker Redmond	
		Beatty	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 1487
		Speaker Redmond	
143		Epton	



<u>31.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 1494
		Speaker Redmond	
		Epton	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 1626
		Speaker Redmond	
144		Anderson	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz)	Question
)	
		Anderson)	Response
		Speaker Redmond	
145		Matijevec)	Question
)	
		Anderson)	Response
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 680
		Speaker Redmond	
		Pullen	
		Speaker Redmond	
146		Houlihan, D.	Supports
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 819
		Speaker Redmond	
		Brummet	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hart)	Question
)	
		Brummet)	Response



<u>32.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
147		Tipsword	
		Brummet	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 825
		Brummet	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Walsh	Object
		Speaker Redmond	Out of the record
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 647
		Speaker Redmond	
148		Kempiners	Sponsor
149		Speaker Redmond	
		Lucco	Objects to Bill
		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
		Clerk O'Brien	House Bill 1036
		Speaker Redmond	
		Robinson	Sponsor
		Speaker Redmond	
		Byers	
150		Speaker Redmond	
		Kempiners	



<u>33.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, J.	
151		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schneider	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Robinson	
		Speaker Redmond	
152		Steele	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Robinson	Postponed Consideration
		Speaker Redmond	HB 1101
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leverenz	Out of record
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1187
		Speaker Redmond	
		Jaffe	
		Speaker Redmond	
153		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Jaffe	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed



<u>34.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
154		Matijeovich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1211
		Hanahan	Sponsor
155		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner)	
)	
		Hanahan)	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
156		Speaker Redmond	
		Schneider	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hoffman	
157		Speaker Redmond	
		Mudd)	
)	
158		Hanahan)	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Anderson)	
)	
159		Hanahan)	
160		Speaker Redmond	
		Anderson	Speaks to Bill
161		Speaker Redmond	



<u>35.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	
162		Speaker Redmond	
		McGrew	Previous question, move
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hanahan	To close
163		Speaker Redmond	
		Lucco	Support
		Speaker Redmond	
164		Hanahan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hanahan	Wants Postponed Consideration
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	Objects
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevec	Point of order
165		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	Objects
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1218
		Speaker Redmond	
		R. Dunn	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hoffman	
166		R. Dunn	



<u>36.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	Point of order
		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1272
		Speaker Redmond	
		Yourrell	Sponsor
167		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber)	
)	
168		Yourrell)	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Waddell)	
)	
		Yourrell)	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Van Duyne	
		Yourrell	Yields to Conti
169		Speaker Redmond	
		Conti)	
)	
		Van Duyne)	
		Yourrell)	
)	
		Van Duyne)	
170		Speaker Redmond	
		Deuster)	
)	
		Yourrell)	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1517
171		Speaker Redmond	
	8:44	Mautino	



<u>37.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond)	
		Totten)	
		Mautino	
		Speaker Redmond	
172		Speaker Redmond	
		Daniels)	
)	
		Mautino)	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1713 - 3rd Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
173		Schneider	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Hanahan)	
)	
174		Mautino)	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hudson)	
)	
		Schneider)	
175		Speaker Redmond	
		Tuerk)	
)	
		Schneider)	'No'
	8:52	Speaker Redmond	
		Schneider	To close
		Mudd)	
)	
176		Speaker Redmond)	
)	
		Schneider)	



38. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
		Speaker Redmond	HB 1713 lost
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1740 - 3rd Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		McGrew	Leave return to 2nd
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
177		Speaker Redmond	
182		McGrew O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
		McMaster)	
)	
		McGrew)	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber)	
)	
178		McGrew)	
		Speaker Redmond	
		McGrew	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Adopted
		McGrew)	
)	
		Speaker Redmond)	
179		D. Houlihan	Inquiry
		Speaker Redmond	
		McGrew	Explain HB 691
		Speaker Redmond	
		Wikoff)	Yield
)	
180		McGrew)	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
39.			
181		Lechowicz) McGrew)	
		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1741
		Speaker Redmond	
		Tipsword	Sponsor
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
182		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1781
		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1804
		Mudd	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Simms) Mudd)	
183		Speaker Redmond	
		Mudd	Move back to 2nd
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1929
		Speaker Redmond	
		Pechous	
184		Kane) Pechous)	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mahar) Pechous)	
185		Mahar	Speaker to Bill
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>40.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Huff)) Pechous)	
186		Speaker Redmond	
		Pechous	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bradley	
		Speaker Redmond, Schlickman) Pechous	Postponed Consideration
187	9:20	Clerk O'Brien	HB 2190
		Speaker Redmond	
		Epton	
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2244 - 3rd Reading
	9:23	Schoeberlein	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	Leave, etc.
188		Speaker Redmond	Back to HB 2244, passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2282 - 3rd Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
		Tuerk	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman)	
)	
		Tuerk)	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	Speaks to Bill
189		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	



<u>41.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		9:30	Speaker Redmond	
			Tuerk	To close
190			Speaker Redmond	
			Byers	
			Speaker Redmond	HB 2282 lost
			Robinson	HB 1036 back to 2nd
			Speaker Redmond)	
			Schlickman)	
			Speaker Redmond	
			Matijevidch	
191			Speaker Redmond	
			Schlickman)	
)	
			Matijevidch)	
			Speaker Redmond	
			Walsh	Removes objections
			Matijevidch	Vote 'no' on 2190
			Speaker Redmond	Leave granted
			Matijevidch	Leave for HB 1099 & 2001
			Speaker Redmond	
			McMaster	
			Speaker Redmond	
			Matijevidch)	
)	
192			McMaster)	
			Speaker Redmond	
			Cunningham	
			Speaker Redmond	



42.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Hoxsey	'Aye' on HB 571 & 1626
		Speaker Redmond	
		Daniels)	HB 855, 856, 857
)	
		Speaker Redmond)	
		Bradley)	
)	
193		Daniels)	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Barnes	Announcement
		Speaker Redmond	
		Pierce	
		Speaker Redmond	Table HB 383
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Redmond	
194		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	House adjourned

