

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. We'll have to stand at ease for'til the call of the Chair. Probably fifteen or twenty minutes. A couple of Committees are still out.

The House will come to order. We'll be led in prayer by Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Henry David Thoreau said: 'I'm amused to see from my window here, how busily man has divided and staked off his domain. God must smile at his puny fences running hither and thither everywhere over the land.' Let us pray. Heavenly Father, the Sovereign Lord of all things, who alone hast ordained the plan for this world of Thy creation. We come to Thee this day for guidance and direction....as Members of this House of Representatives. We are grateful, O Father, for the privilege of self-government. Yet we ask that in what we do we will be inspired to seek only those laws which are of lasting and universal benefit....rather than enact those which are transitory and of immediate value to but a few. Make us ever constant in our judgments to test all that we do by Thy commandments and the laws which Thou hast given to mankind so that we may share in the affecting of Thy Kingdom on earth, through Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Senate Bills, First Reading. Representative Waddell, for what purpose do you rise? Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, excuse for the purpose of illness, Representative Kucharski and Representative Dyer."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there objections? Hearing none, the record will so show. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 153, Rigney, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of General Services, First Reading of the Bill.



2.

Senate Bill 340, Hoxsey, a Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 486, Pouncey, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Public Aid. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 488, Pouncey, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Personnel First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "For those of you who didn't know it, a former Member, B. B. Wolfe, now the Judge, visited us and here he is. He's going to leave. "

Wolfe, B. B.: "Be at ease, House. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.....Mr. Speaker. I don't have a point of order this afternoon but I would like to make a point. This week we celebrated 'Law Day USA'. The theme was 'Partners-in-Law'. And let me say for the benefit of the Members of this House, the dedication, the work, the effort that you are putting into good legislation makes you a partner in the justice system. Good luck. Stay well. Keep on your feet until the end of the Session. And hopefully, Bill, you'll adjourn this House June the 25th. It would be a landmark day in the history of this House. Good luck to all of you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan. Madigan."

Madigan: "Would the record show that Representative Kornowicz is excused because of illness?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Hearing none, the record will so show. House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 427. Representative Bluthardt is recognized. Anybody else that has a Bill in Third Reading, in a similar posture, please let me know. Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm asking leave to bring back 427 to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment?"



Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave?"

Bluthardt: "The Amendment, if I can find it....."

Speaker Redmond: "427 returned to Second. Read it, Mr. Clerk.."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Bluthardt, amends House Bill 427 on page one, line one and so forth."

Bluthardt: "...The Amendment's merely a clarifying Amendment.

We found that in attempting to amend the Bill to clarify the provisions for holding a referendum for eliminating the managerial form of government.....that we had to amend another Section of the Statute. This takes care of that.

I move the adoption of the Amendment."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments?"

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. House Bill 75. Representative Skinner. The Gentleman has asked leave to return House Bill 75 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Are there objections? Hearing none, the Amendment.....er...House Bill 75 returns to the Order of Second Reading. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, a point of information. I have a Bill that I would like to return...from Third Reading to Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "What number is it?"

Geo-Karis: "Hold on.....er....ah...but I don't have the Amendment ready. I wonder if I might just return it and leave it on Second until I get my Amendment ready?"

Speaker Redmond: "What's the number?"

Geo-Karis: "Hold on just a minute. 941."

Speaker Redmond: "It's easier to leave it on Third, according to the Clerk. When you get your Amendment ready, then we return it."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "You don't save anything byRepresentative Skinner. Would you read the Amendment..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Skinner, amends House Bill 75, as amended, on page one and so forth."

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

Houlihan, D.: "Is this Amendment #3? Has the Amendment been distributed?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's Amendment #3.....Has the Amendment been....printed, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "...and been distributed? Can you explain the Amendment, Mr. Skinner?"

Skinner: "What this Amendment does...is prohibit discrimination against property owners...or...or residents of the unincorporated areas of the sanitary districts that we're affecting by this Act."

Houlihan, D.: "Maybe I'm not following you. The sanitary districts involved in this Act are where 80% of the district is within the confines of a(unintelligible) municipality?"

Skinner: "No. That's the original Digest listing. It should be changed in one of the Amendments, in the new Digest; if indeed we ever do get a new Digest. What it does is say that if...'at present time all three sanitary district trustees in sanitary districts that exist for only one municipality and in only one county ... are appointed by the county board'. This splits the appointment process between the county board and the municipality. Yesterday a question was asked about ...what about the poor people in the unincorporated areas, might they be discriminated against? So we're putting it in....quite explicitly that the sanitary district cannot....discriminate against those people that don't live within the city boundaries."



Houlihan, D.: "Well they had a..... discriminated against them anyway...are they? I mean, exactly what does this do? Does thisit says 'there shall be no discrimination'. But it doesn't refer to different scheduling of race or anything else. Is that correct?"

Skinner: "It would seem to me that a general prohibition would be sufficient without having to enumerate different types of discrimination that one might be able to conjure up. That might....I was hoping that would mean that would have more force than perhaps leaving out some inaginative way that the sanitary district might discover to discriminate against unincorporated residents."

Houlihan, D.: "All right."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question Cal. Cal. Skinner. Cal. Will you hold this Bill on Second? I'd like to get an Amendment prepared to strike the Enacting Clause if that would be all right?"

Skinner: "Well, if it is all the same with you, Representative McMaster, I think you are fully capable of opposing this vehemently, on the House floor, and I'll give you that opportunity. I must respectfully decline your kind request."

Speaker Redmond: ".....a special on this Amendment. Representative Lucco. Representative Lucco?...."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to make introduction We have some students up to my left on the Democratic side of the balcony, from St. Anthony's School, in Quincy. They are naturally very ably represented by Representative McClain, Schisler and Kent. The students from St. Anthony's School."

Speaker Redmond: "Did any Representative go to St. Anthony's School? Did any Representative go to St. Anthony's School? St. Peters, huh? Any further discussion on the Amendment #3 to House Bill 75? Those in favor of the Gentleman's



motion indicate by saying 'aye'; 'aye'; opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 127, James Houlihan. He is still in Committee. 234, Representative Jaffe. You request 234 be returned to the order of Second Reading? Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, 234 will be returned to the order of Second Reading. Is there an Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Stearney, amends House Bill 234 by deleting lines 9 through 18 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 would, in fact, become the Bill. It would provide that any person who violates any of the provisions of Section 11-15 (a) of the Act, would commit soliciting for a juvenile prostitute, where the prostitute for whom such person is soliciting, is under 16 years of age. Mr. Jaffe, the Sponsor of this Bill, is in agreement with the Amendment. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe. Any comment on the motion?"

Jaffe: "I'm fully in agreement with the Amendment, Mr. Speaker, and I move..."

Speaker Redmond: "...The Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor say 'aye'.....Representative D. L. Houlihan.."

Houlihan: "I have a question of the Sponsor..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Houlihan, D.L.: "What's the net effect, Representative Stearney, of this Amendment? How does it....either change the Bill...it apparently changes the Bill that you've described in its entirety. What is the effect then, of this Amendment, as related to what is the existing provision of the criminal



code?"

Stearney: "Well, I don't....if....I don't have the Chapter 38 before me as to the Act which is soliciting. However, the Bill, House Bill 234, as recently filed, would parallel House Bill....the present Act, but this here provision just applies now to where the prostitute is under 16 years of age and would create a separate Act altogether."

Houlihan, D. L.: "All right. And did the Bill, as originally introduced, make a newSection or a new offense, which is termed 'soliciting for a juvenile prostitute' use the age of 18 and what your Amendment does is make that age 16?.....With the girl involved as 16?"

Stearney: "Yes."

Houlihan, D. L.: "Perhaps I should also direct that question to the Sponsor of the Bill. Is that the sole effect of this Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Who is going to respond? Representative Stearney? Representative Jaffe? Representative 'Alphonse'? Representative....."

Jaffe: ".....What the Bill does.....what the Amendment does is ...that we were afraid that you'd have a situation where you might have someone who is under 16 years of age soliciting for a prostitute who might besay 25 years of age. One of the things that the Amendment does is make sure that the person who is under age does not get hit with the more severe penalty."

Houlihan, D.L.: "The person under age being the prostitute, is that correct? Isn't that the one who is doing the soliciting?"

Jaffe: "Well, what we want to do is we want to protect kids, so we indicated thatwhere the prostitute is under 16, and the individual is overyou know....is an adult, that person will have the more severe penalty and that's basically what this Amendment does."

Houlihan, D. L.: "All right. Thank you."



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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. To give you an idea of what we are trying to do here, we're trying to call all Bills on Third Reading and Postponed Consideration to which Amendments have been proposed and have been filed. Then we will go back to House Bills, Third Reading, starting in numerical order and goes all the way through the 157 Bills that appear on there. Preferably by 5 o'clock. 427, we've taken that....?"

Clerk O'Brien: "What Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "...427, we've already done, haven't we? 614... Representative Von Boeckman on the floor? 614... Is there an Amendment on 614? Representative Von Boeckman, do you desire to have 614 returned to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment? Does he have leave? Hearing no objections it will be returned to the order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Von Boeckman, amends House Bill 614 on page one, line one, by deleting 6.107 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Wait until I find the Amendment..."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you want to take this out of the record for a moment? We'll go to 507. The one I missed. Representative Bennett desire to have that returned to Second Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing none, it will be returned to the order of Second Reading. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk. 507."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Dan Houlihan-Beatty, amends House Bill 507 on page one, line 13 by inserting before the period the following, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bennett."



Bennett: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is an Amendment being presented by Representative Houlihan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan? Is this your Amendment? Representative Beatty. Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Amendment #2, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, speaks out...of this increase of a judgement that will.. it removes the local school district or community college or local government so that if a judgment is taken against local government, school district or community college district, the interest on that would remain at 6 % rather than 10 %. We believe this is a good Amendment along with a good public policy...That we shouldn't really go to the 8 % level as we would with the private individual, since we are dealing with private funds. I ask the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, although it may not seem significant it really is because the original intent of this Amendment was to bring an old interest rate of 6% that is charged on all judgments of courts or juries, from 6 % to what is now really the market level of 8 %. In fact, in many instances, that is even low itself. As I indicated, the real reason for this is that in the past, and I think you find this in some of the metropolitan areas to a great extent, insurance companies, once a judgment is rendered against a defendant; say...an insurance company is defending someone, there are many frivolous appeals. And other appeals that are filed just so the insurance industry can really make money on that 6 %. This would stop that. The intent aboveboard was that all, including defendants who were governmental entities..would not file..by either the insurance company representing them or any other party, would not file frivolous appeals just to cause a delay of sometimes up to five years before a party, who has won the case, has won



the case.....could collect their money. In many instances this has been through long deliberation by juries ...to... to finally determine that a plaintiffs case is good and a judgment should be entered. Then it takes up to five years in some instances before they can collect that money. So the intent of this law, all the way back to 1891 through the present, was that during that time there should be a market type interest rate on all judgments. That's the intent.... To take out governmental entity, I think, would defeat, partially, the purpose of this Bill. Because governmental entities are also insured by insurance companies and why should they be treated any differently than any other defendant who has lost after a complete jury trial or court trial? For that reason I would oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, Dan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak in support of the Amendment which I think is fundamentally necessary if we are to protect all local units of government and school districts in this state. Otherwise the Bill, as adopted, would have a very....very severe financial impact on every unit of local government in Illinois and I ask the support of the Membership for the Amendment and I believe it's a very reasonable one."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield to a question."

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Tipsword: "I wonder if you can enlighten us? How many school districts or junior colleges or municipalities, local governments are self-insurers. Aren't most of them insured?"

Beatty: "Well, I can speak for the City of Chicago. On many of the tort claims they're self-insured and it's the policy of the city on substantial tort judgments to let them ride at interest for ...any time from six months to a



year and a half. So this would cost the City of Chicago and the taxpayers ...an additional 2 % per annum...and it might result in a real estate property tax increase in the City of Chicago, due to this little Bill. I don't see any need for us...going for 2 % when you are dealing with local units of government."

Tipsword: "Why is the policy to let them ride for a year to a year and a half?"

Beatty: "Well, it's just the way that they have historically paid these larger judgments. In other words, the city has a budget that anticipates so much in tort judgment but it can't anticipate everything until after the judgment is brought down through the courts then they subsequently fund it through city ...through the city council. It takes some time and it takes some time to get the money from one taxing time to another."

Tipsword: "If I may address myself to it? I know in the remainder of the state, every since the Kaneland School District Decision, by the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois. I know of very few school districts, I know of none, in fact, in my own knowledge....that are not insured. I doubt very seriously if there are any junior colleges that are not insured and to my knowledge...I know of no municipalities.....in our local government...in the major portion of Illinois that are not insured. I must agree with Representative Bennett that what this does is provide a windfall solely and only to insurance companies and a reason for them to delay the payment of very valid judgments just as long as they possibly can. I would....I think it might be dangerous to have an Amendment that would say to their self-insurers that this lesser judgment amount might apply but perhaps we could make some exception for areas that this is especially difficult for the City of Chicago for areas of an excess population....over a figure of a million or whatever might be reasonable. But I know in the rest of the state I think that this would be most



most helpful in getting the judgments paid, in getting the courts dockets cleared off....because almost every area I'm sure is an insured area and this would only amount to a windfall to the companies that insure the school districts, the junior colleges and the municipalities."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative D. L. Houlihan to close...er... Beatty to close, pardon me..... He yields to D. L. Houlihan."

Houlihan, D. L.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a Cosponsor of the Amendment I will close on behalf of Representative Beatty. I don't think that the Membership should bemislead by the idea that some of these are self-insured. Self-insured or not there's still going to be a substantial increase in cost to local units of government in the school district. Again I earnestly solicit the support of the Membership in favor of this reasonable Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 73 'aye' and 45 'no'; and the Gentleman's motion prevails and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendmets."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 614. Representative Von Boeckman. This is on Second Reading. Has the Amendment been read?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Von Boeckman, amends House Bill 614 on page one line one and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: " Representative Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a technical Amendment.....that is required by the Secretary of State's Office. It has to do with the implementation of the photo ID and photo drivers license



and I sincerely ask your support for this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative D. L. Houlihan. Please give the Gentleman order. You are getting unruly."

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

Von Boeckman: "I yield."

Houlihan, D. L.: "Jim, will the effects of this Amendment delete the requirement of an examination?"

Von Boeckman: "No. No. It's just the legislation that we had passed to implement the photo ID. There was a technical error that the Secretary of State felt must be implemented in order to properly implement the program."

Houlihan, D. L.: "Jim, are we talking on the same Bill? Is this 614.....about issuing drivers licenses for juveniles for motorcycles?"

Von Boeckman: "The Bill covers all the drivers' license. The Motorcycle Bill.....this just changes a portion of.....the Bill actually just changes from 16 to 18but...what this does is strictly.....through an oversight...and it's too late to get a Bill in, I agreed to have an Amendment on my Bill which is relevant to the....."

Houlihan, D. L.: "Thank you, no further questions."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 641. Ralph Dunn. You desire to have that returned to the order of Second Reading? Ralph Dunn in the chamber? Take that out of the record. 297, Von Boeckman. You desire that one to be returned to the order of Second Reading? Is that correct?"

Von Boeckman: "That is correct....."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? With no objection, it will be returned, Mr. Clerk."



Von Boeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Amendment was offered by Representative Martin and I would appreciate the adoption of that Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion?"

Von Boeckman: "But Mr. Speaker, I dowould like to have leave to amend House Bill 297 on its face. On page one, line 13, there is a word.....a word is misspelled. I would like to amend it on its face to change the word from accompanies to accompany."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Make it.....Representative Schneider."

Schnieder: "Are we now on the Amendment, Mr. Speaker?...and if we are, can we have an explanation of it?"

Speaker Redmond: "First, ...we have leave to amend on its face. Now the Amendment itself."

Schneider: "Oh!"

Speaker Redmond: "Will you explain the Amendment, Mr. Von Boeckman?"

Von Boeckman: "I would like to yield to Representative Martin."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lynn Martin.....The Gentleman standing between the Chair and Representative Lynn Martin..please sit down.....Hoffman, Campbell, ...Sarunas..."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Deuster.....down...."

Martin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment clarifies the procedure by which any local government unit would turn in the amount of money that they feel the program is going to cost. It sets up a procedure very similar to the one set up by the General Assembly...with the...when they tried to make fiscal accountability into the State Fair Board. It works between the Auditor General and the Governor Representative Von Boeckman feels it is a good Amendment and tightens up a procedure that, although good, still has some loopholes. We did not want districts getting more than they should or having that kind of option. Secondly, the Amendment does also indicate what will happen if the



funding is not available, which the original Bill did not have."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schnieder: "And what is that? What happens to it?"

Martin, Lynn: "If the....any....If the mandated programs are not funded, then the districts do not have to....they do not have to use the program."

Schneider: "They do not have to offer the program and this effects schools, right?"

Martin, Lynn: "Pardon? I'm sorry, I did not hear you?"

Schneider: "This Amendment..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order..."

Schneider: "...So if the money is not there for mandated programs, and it effects schools, then the schools do not have to offer the program?"

Martin, Lynn: "Any new programs after 1978, for any district, as Von Boeckman's Bill calls for. Whether it be city, county, school district, any governmental unit..."

Schnieder: "So it effects..."

Martin, Lynn: "It does effect schools..."

Schneider: "So it effectsno standing mandated programs... only those..."

Martin, Lynn: "It does not..."

Schneider: "Thank you..."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Levin wants to make a motion..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, was there a fiscal note filed on House Bill 297?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, and I don't believe any was requested.."

Levin: "I would like to request one at this point."

Speaker Redmond: "Is it in writing?"

Levin: "I will submit it in writing."



Speaker Redmond: "I know it.....could put it back to Second....
Representative Martin....Martin,Lynn Martin..."

Martin, Lynn: "Mr. Speaker, certainly the Gentleman can require a fiscal note, but since the Bill speaks to any new programs the General Assembly might put into effect after 1978, I don't know how they would be able to figure out what we're going to come up with after 1978."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, on that consideration, if the note would reflect that, that would be deeply appreciated by us. Those of us who are concerned. If it reflects zero, then that is accurate. It may reflect something else, then the appropriate agencies ought to be contacted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I see in the Digest that on April 1, there was a fiscal note requested and on April 7 it was ruled that the fiscal note was not required and I would ask that you so rule now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, what she says is true. We voted in this House that a fiscal note was not applicable."

Speaker Redmond: "Is that correct, Mr. Clerk? We'll take this out of the record and we'll find out. If, in fact, this House decided a fiscal note did not apply, then you cannot be effective at this date. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Gentleman who is the Sponsor of this Bill is absolutely correct. I had asked for the fiscal note. He then moved that the fiscal note was not necessary and a majority of this House..... present...voting...sustained him in his motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Had you gone to Northwestern Law School you would have considered that heresay. I think you should look for the best evidence. Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Is it out of the record?Mr. Speaker???"

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



Schneider: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Put this one back in the record now. A call upon the Clerk to advise the Body what the official records of the Clerk's office show with respect to the fiscal note."

Clerk O'Brien: "Relating to House Bill 297. On April 1, a fiscal note was requested by Representative Totten. On April 7, it was determined a fiscal note was not required and the Bill was moved on Second Reading on April 20... to Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider, it would appear to me that that ruling by this Body would prevail. Third Reading. 334... Representative Beatty. ...You desire this to be returned to Second Reading."

Beatty: "Yes I do."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, it will be returned. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Beatty, amends House Bill 334, as amended, on page one, line one and so forth."

Beatty: "What this Amendment does is actually eliminate the fund that has been used in the past, called the 'Court of Claims Fund'. Instead of using that fund, we just eliminate that and have a direct appropriation from the same place where the funds came from before...from the General Revenue Fund and from the Road Fund. So there is nothing controversial about this. It's just elimination...you know, of sending the money into the Court of Claims Fund. We'd just eliminate that and we'll appropriate directly. I ask a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 51 'aye' and one 'no', and the Gentleman's motions prevails and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Beatty, amends House Bill 334, as amended, by inserting immediately after Section 1, the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan. I can't see Representative Beatty. Representative Domico."

Beatty: "Amendment #3 merely makes this effective for the next fiscal year so that we can start right in with this change. I ask for a favorable...."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion?"

Beatty: "...Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Hearing none, the question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye'; opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion carried. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Consideration Postponed appears House Bill 1036. Representative Robinson is recognized. Robinson..."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, just last night Amendment #5 was passed out. Amendment #5 deletes all reference to a Section that said that no Member of the"

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk..."

Clerk O'Brien: "We're actually on Amendment #6..."

Robinson: "Amendment #6?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Robinson, amends House Bill 1036 on page one, line two; on page one line nine and so forth."

Robinson: "Okay. This Amendment deletes all reference to the Section that says that no Member of the board could be involved in partisan political activity. We're taking that Section out.....because of the objection voiced last night."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #6."



Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye'; opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Turn to the Order of Postponed Consideration. House Bills, Third Reading. House Bills, Third Reading Representative Von Boeckman, are you seeking recognition?"

Von Boeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like the opportunity to introduce my wife Norma, who is seated in the balcony above me, my niece, Gerry Lynn McDonald, who was just elected to the school board in Pekin, her daughter, Michelle and Rhonda Claussen. And Miss Perron, Miss Bradovich. . . . they are from Broadmoor Intermediate School, who just won the Class B state champion. . . . They are. . . . The other Representatives of course, is my good friend Dick Luft and John Anderson."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 14, Representative Yourell. House Bills, Third Reading."

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."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like first to tell you and you can see by the numbers of these Bills that they were prefiled and have been considered and have been on the calendar for Amendment and for discussion and we think now we have a series of Bills that will go to the need of the Administrative Procedure Act as it relates to certain state agencies. . . . Could also tell you since the introduction of these Bills by myself and Dick Luft, back in December, we have conferred with Representative Edgar, on the Republican side and Representative Edgar had a series of Bills dealing with the same subject and so we thought to better move the legislation we would go together and have hyphenated Sponsorship of Yourell and



Edgar. We have done that and what House Bill 14 does is amends the Illinois APA...the Administrative Procedure Act, to establish the joint committee on administrative rules and requires state agencies to file copies of all rules with such committee and provides that this committee shall review and make recommendations regarding these rules to the agencies and relevant standing committees of the General Assembly. The Bill was developed by the House Executive Subcommittee on administrative rulemaking during the 79th General Assembly. The organization of the Joint Committee on Rules creates a Committee composed of four Members appointed by the Speaker, four by the House Minority Leader, four by the Senate and four by the Senate Minority Leader...for a total of 16. The joint committee is required to lead at least monthly. A quorum of the joint committee consists of at least a majority of members appointed to the House. House Bill 14, creating the Legislative Joint Committee on Administrative Rules would go a long way toward insuring responsible legislative oversight of the rule-making functions of state agencies. In many instances administrative rules are more significant than enabling legislation that authorizes them. Yet there does not appear presently to be a workable way for the Legislature to maintain oversight, let alone control, for this increasing important governmental function. So I would be delighted to answer any questions and I know that Representative Edgar would as well and I would ask for a favorable vote on House Bill 14."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 'aye' and 5 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared



passed. 15, Representative Yourell."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 15, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 15 again amends the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. Provides for a thirty day notice period for the rule making. Begins to run upon publication of the notice in a weekly bulletin service of the Secretary of State....and requires such service to also include the text of the proposed rules....changes and the means for submission of views by interested persons. The Bill also extends the maximum effective period of emergency rules from 120 to 150 days. Amendment #3, by Representative Edgar, added some things to the Bill and I would call on Representative Edgar to further explain House Bill 15."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "I'd rather explain the last one but you got it through so quick. We included in it language with procedures by which the Committee would have an opportunity to review the rules and 'regs' once the agency promulgated and sent them to the Committee, the Joint Committee. Also, the Amendments we put on this Bill, which would provide for the Secretary of State to publish his weekly, ...monthly volume, to report the rules and 'regs'. We work with the state agencies, the Department of Transportation, the Department of Agriculture, in particular, to work out their problems with this Bill and they have no problems with this Bill now. I think this along with 14 and 16 would provide the Illinois General Assembly with the tools to really do something seriously about the rules and regulations that's being promulgated by the hundreds each year by state agencies....And we would join 21"



other states that currently have such a mechanism to put a check on bureaucratic rule. I think if we're serious about doing something about the bureaucracy, this is the first step that would provide us in Illinois with the necessary knowledge to do something meaningful in this area and I would encourage everyone to support this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Apparently I misunderstand the Bills but one of the things that I seem to identify as a problem is, number one; that we're now asking the Legislature to impose some kind of restrictions and monitoring of administrative rules and regulations which seems to run counter to some of the responsibilities of the Executive Branch. I see us as a separate branch and, therefore, really meddling. Number two; what I observe about these also is that frequently we will provide statutory language which allows agencies to establish rules and regulations because we cannot be writing precisely the kinds of things that we want into that agencies functions. So until I can really perhaps comprehend them, that it seems to me that we're making a mistake, in fact we're going into kind of a circular argument and I would, therefore, . . . I'll vote 'no' on those."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Porter: "'Bus', what is the 30-day notice period....run from now? Is this an increase or a decrease? It's hard to tell from what you said."

Yourell: "There is no change in the....in the rule making notice, from the present....what it is presently."

Porter: "The Synopsis says 'it begins to run upon publication of



the notice in the weekly bulletin'. When does it begin to run now?"

Yourell: "Well, it's the same way. But that is not in the law. It was just clarifying it with the thirty day start up period. Upon publication in the weekly service bulletin of the Secretary of State's Office."

Porter: "I see. What's the reason for extending the maximum effective period of emergency rolls by thirty additional days? From four months to five months?"

Yourell: "That was a recommendation of certain departments. The Department of Transportation and the Department of Revenue and the Department of Agriculture, to give them more time in order to comply."

Porter: "Why?"

Yourell: "Well, I don't know. It was just a suggestion of theirs."

Porter: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman. Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question? What is the estimated cost to the state of this program, Representative?"

Yourell: "From the Secretary of State's Office we have a fiscal note of \$134,000."

Hoffman: "One hundred and thirty-four thousand dollars, initial start of cost or is that an annual increase in the cost?"

Yourell: "That's initial."

Hoffman: "What is thewhat is the annual estimate? Is there any on that?"

Yourell: "No. We don't have that." After the initial start up it should be just a matter of another function of the Secretary of State's Office. It should not require additional funds. At least that's what they suggest to us. I might indicate to you that the Secretary of State's Office has endorsed the legislation along with the Illinois Manufacturing Association, the State Chamber of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Revenue,



the Department of Transportation and the Governor has indicated a friendly attitude toward these Bills."

Hoffman: "Fine. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty.....is it? Who wants recognition over there? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, only to add that 'Bus' Yourell, as a member of the Executive Committee, last Session, spent a lot of time on the subject matter, as did the Committee and I would wholly commend this Bill. We studied it and I think it came out unanimously, from a Subcommittee of the Executive Committee andit's a good Bill and we ought to go in that direction. So I commend it to you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Just to ask for a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 129 'aye' and 8 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Thought I'd give a report of what we're liable to face. We've been in Session now for an hour and a half. We've passed two Bills. We have about one hundred and fifty Bills on Third Reading. We have about seven hundred and eighty Bills on Second Reading. Ora pro nobis. One six....."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 16, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 16 is the last Bill in the package and it again amends the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act to make the Act applicable to all administrative agencies and it repeals an Act Concerning Administrative Rules."



This Bill also was developed by the House Executive Subcommittee on administrative rule making during the 79th General Assembly. In 1975, the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act was signed into law, however, it was not applicable to any state agency.....until the state agencies enabling legislation was amended to make it applicable. In 1976 approximately seven state agencies had their enabling legislation amended to make the Illinois APA Act applicable. The House Human Resources Committee developed these Bills and all state agencies involved were in the human resources area. Now, what this Bill does is make the Act applicable to all state agencies. In cases conflicting between the APA and the Act creating or conferring power on an agency...the APA will control. Where an Act creating or conferring power on an agency establishes administrative procedure is not covered by the Illinois APA, such procedure shall remain in effect. I would suggest to you that House Bill 16 is a badly needed Bill that would extend the provisions of the new Administrative Procedure Act adopted in 1975, to all agencies. The Administrative Procedure Act, as you know, is a major advance in reforming state agencies rule making and adjudicatory functions. Unfortunately Section 2 ... of that Act makes it applicable only to the extent that the Act creating or conferring power on such agency adopt, by express reference, the provisions of the Act. Thus, virtually no agencies are now covered by the Act. House Bill 16 would not only extend coverage of this excellent legislation to all state agencies. but it would bring some much needed uniformity to state administrative procedures. I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker.....and...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On the Bill itself. I was the Sponsor of 14 and 15, but this Bill is very different. For a very



purposeful reason the Administrative Procedures Act was conceived to be adopted agency by agency, not on a wholesale basis, each agency's mission should be looked at. Each agency's fiscal problems, as it relates to the Administrative Procedures Act, should be examined and then necessary exceptions worked out. Last Session of the General Assembly the Administrative Procedures Study Committee was developed by this House of Representatives. We have submitted some forty Bills. Those Bills are good whether this Bill passes or not. We found that in each of the agencies.....they needed some exemptions. That there were fiscal implications. Let me give you an example: Unemployment Compensation, their office is under the....will be under the APA under one of the Bills now pending, but if under this Bill, under the Yourell Bill, there was a \$250,000 ticketcost for certified mail as required by the APA. What we did was to look at that and say; 'now....it should be uncertified, it need not be certified'. Under that Bill every hearing, when an applicant comes into the office, that would be a contested case...within the meaning of the Act. We exempted both hearings. Public Aid, most of our rule making is done under federal....federal rules and all they have to do is adopt those rules. They have no choices. Under the Yourell Bill, it would be the contrary. They would have to go through the whole rule making process for rules over which they have nono judgment at all on. Financial Institutions, there are some quick take provisions that allow protection for currency exchanges.... and for people who have complaints against currency exchanges. For people who have complaints against some of the other financial institutions. You abolish the quick take procedures, in the hands of the federal.....the financial institutions. Office of Education, significant exemptions as to what's a rule and to what isn't a rule. On a case by case, agency by agency way. Now what you



have done by this is to go into a land....sort of a mindlessness. We will not know what the impact of this Bill is.....on each agency. The Amendments that have been put on it make it worse. Make it a more difficult Bill even to workout. For example; it says that if there are existing procedures, those procedures will prevail. Does that mean that an agency can't change its procedures? Does that mean that an agency, once they change any procedure, is under the Act? I don't know. Neither does the Sponsor know. Neither does anybody know. Fourteen and fifteen, House Bill 14 and 15 were reasonable Bills. This Bill should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "I'd like to rise to support the Sponsor of this measure. I think this is a very necessary Bill.....to make the last two Bills we just passed....work. Now we have sat down and talked with various state agencies and worked out the problems they have brought to us, but I think the time has come to bring the state agencies under this rule. We can't wait for a piecemeal approach. I think the citizens of this state want the legislature to start putting a stop to all the rules and regulations. This Bill is very necessary. This legislation has the support of the administration. I'd appreciate a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell. Representative Peters. Pardon me.....Representative Yourell to close."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Greiman and I have discussed at length...these Bills. As you can tell by the numbers...of these Bills, 14, 15 and 16...they were prefiled. Now it is May, and not one state agency, that Representative Greiman has mentioned, has come to us, the Sponsors, Yourell and Edgar, and to our staff that assisted greatly in the preparation of these Bills, to indicate that they were not in favor of House Bill 16. I would like to



compliment Representative Greiman because he has developed, with the Commission, a series of Bills that will do one thing that's most important. They will implement and complement House Bills 14, 15 and 16. I would hope that when Representative Greiman calls those Bills, that all of you will be in accord and vote for those Bills because they are a necessary adjunct to House Bills 14, 15 and 16 and I now ask for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 16."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 125 'aye' and 17 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Two one....Representative Hanahan. Out of the record. Representative Lucco, for what purpose do you rise?"

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a matter of introduction. In the Speaker's gallery up overhead here, are students from the Tri-City fifth grade, in Buffalo. They have with them their two teachers, Mrs. Dora Lee Hoffman and Mr. Jerry Brown. These people, of course, along with others of this district are represented by Representative Kane, Representative Robinson and Representative Jones. Up in the Speaker's gallery....please. Also..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative"

Lucco: ".....also, Mr. Speaker, we in the House are very well pleased today to have with us many members of the Library Association, who put on the fine luncheon today at noon. Would the members of the Library Association please stand? Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "...Two seven....Representative Ebbesen. Out of the record. Four two, Representative Mautino. Mautino, 42."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 42, a Bill for an Act to amend



Sections of the Illinois Horse Racing Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker

House Bill 42 does exactly what the Synopsis states. It amends the Horse Racing Act of 1975 and provides for the inclusion of the Mid-Continent Livestock Exposition with the International Livestock Exposition. This is a substantive Bill to House Bill 43, which is in the Senate appropriating the money for that particular program. Also, the Amendment #1, offered by me in Committee, took out expenses from that particular substantive legislation and allows only for the premiums and awards of that program to be included as part of the Illinois Horse Racing Act of 1975. I'd be happy to answer any questions. I ask for an affirmative Roll Call."

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

(see special..)



Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Have all voted who wish? On this question 123 'aye' and 11 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 65."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 65, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Fair Employment Practices Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 65 seeks to amend the Fair Employment Practices Act to provide a new classification which would end discrimination by reason of age. There's grown up a practice in this land which is not in the spirit of this country. That practice is mandatory retirement. It has always, in my judgment, been the fundamental American belief that each of us is to be judged, each of us is to be determined on our own individual merits and our own individual capabilities. The concept of mandatory retirement says 'no'. We lump you....we lump people who have a great part of our natural resources, of our human resources, we say when you reach an age....you are a 'has-been'. You are out of the work force. It is a cruel....cruel system. Cruel, because in some companies even before mandatory retirement you are put on the shelf. In companies that have a 65 mandatory retirement age, sometimes when you are 62, essentially you stop then because they say, 'Well, let's not give so and so a raise because he's going to be out of here in two years or three years'. Opponents of this claim that it will effect ...adversely...the pension plans. I submit to the contrary, it will sweeten those pension plans. When people.....let's look for a moment at our most important pension plan, Social Security, people who stay in the



work force longer will not be taking their Social Security. They will be continuing to add to the assets of the Social Security System. That's true of pensionsgenerally. In order to make it easier on some companies the Bill contains an Amendment that'll allow... three years for companies now having pension plans, to come under the Act. That will give them ample time.... ample time to come within the Act. Ladies and Gentlemen, we do many things, we politicians try and do many things for senior citizens. We wrack our brains to think of what we can do for them. But this is something a little different. We want to just let them work. Let them stand in dignity. Let them continue to be part of our society. Thank you. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Davis. Corneal Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm one of the Sponsors of this Bill....but I think I ought to warn you that the Fair Employment Practices Commission now is being overloaded. And I hope that our Commission, here in Illinois, will not experience what the EEOC, the Federal Commission, is experiencing. The Federal Commission is over three years behind, now, in complaints. It would take you over.....If you filed a charge of unfair employment with the Federal Commission, it would take you more than three years to be heard.... despite the fact that we passed initiatory powers which gives us the right to take on Federal cases and we have that right. The Federal Government is paying for some of those cases. We are now over a year behind and perhaps a year and a half. We might be two years now. And when we put this Bill on, I hope we don't experience the same conditions we're experiencing under the Federal Fair Employment Practices Act. Yeah, you can charge them with an unfair employment practice, but getting a hearing is



the thing. Now, what is the reason? The reason is, we have the women to take care of the aged and the blind. The reason is we do not have enough staff....and I'm simply saying this to warn you that when the appropriations come out for that Commission I want you to know that we don't have enough staff to handle the business now that is before us and if we're not careful we're going to be three years behind in these complaints.... in handling them. We need more money for the Fair Employment Practices Commission. If you vote for this Bill, and I'm going to vote for it, but if you vote for this Bill...when we ask you for enough money for staff, please don't vote 'no' on it. Because we're only fooling ourselves when we file an unfair complaint, then we can't get a hearing on it. I would advise you....talk to the Fair Employment Commission and they will tell you how far we are behind and they'll tell you the reason they are behind is'We don't have enough staff'. I would urge you to vote for it but I'd also urge you that when that appropriation Bill hits the floor to give them enough money to service these complaints or it will have no effect at all because it will be like whistling Santa Clause to desert, you just won't get a hearing on an unfair employment practices charge."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Will the Sponsor of the Bill yield to a couple of questions? Representative Greiman, what is the effect of Amendment #1 and Amendment #2?"

Greiman: "Amendment #1 takes into consideration the problem of management trainee programs and union apprentice programs."

Leinenweber: "What is the problem in relating to management training and union apprentice programs?"

Greiman: "Well, many of the people who are interested in this subject suggested that ...that's one place where it might be logical and reasonable to have some age discrimination, and I can't say that I disagree with that. So, in answer



to that I did amend the Bill to exempt management trainee programs and union apprentice programs."

Leinenweber: "In other words, without doing that, the unions would have opposed the Bill?"

Greiman: "On the contrary. As a matter of fact, it was not the unions, it was business who said.....who asked me that. I did respond to business's request."

Leinenweber: "All right. What else do the Amendments do?"

Greiman: "Another Amendment.....restricts this to.....removes public employment simply because they are....we have Civil Service problems as well as public pension problems to work on. I must tell you, Harry, that it is my intention to immediately work on those problems so that within that three-year period we will have public pensions and public Civil Service in the same shape that we have the private sector."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address myself to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Leinenweber: "The Sponsor in Amendments number one and two has sold out,...in my opinion, the thrust of this Bill, which is to aid the senior citizens by removing.....particularly by removing ...public employment. Nowhere are the elderly discriminated against more than in the public sector. For years teachers have been forced to retire at the age of sixty-five because of arbitrary rules regardless of their individual merit. I'm a Cosponsor of this Bill. I thought ...I think it is a good Bill but I don't think it is good just for the private sector. So I am going to vote 'present' on the Bill. I hope that everybody else does too so that these obnoxious Amendments can be removed."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Porter."

Porter: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, he will."



Porter: "Representative Greiman, you made reference to private pension fundsbut only tangentially. I wonder if you could expand upon the effect of this legislation on private pension funds?"

Greiman: "Well, some of the managers of the pension funds have been coming in.....running around in the halls and.... here....you know....and giving testimony, as well, before the Committee on Labor and Commerce, that there would be, somehow, be an adverse impact on private pension plans because they are often zeroed in on a specific age. I'm not sure that I agree with them but in....you know....in response to that claim, I did give them three years to amend their plans to come into conformity to the Act. They would not be under the Act, which is why, by the way, there is little fiscal impact of this Bill for certainly the next three years or so. Probably for the next five years. There would benegligible fiscal impactAs far as Representative Davis commented there would be little impact. But, they would have a period to give themselves time to bring those Acts intoto bring those agreements and trust agreements into conformity with this Act."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Greiman: "Yes."

Hudson: "Al, I think the problem that I find most difficult to wrestle with is about your concept. There is no one who believes any more that....anymore than I do that many of our older people have a very great deal to contribute to society. But I am trying to put myself in the place of the employer who will, under the provisions of this Bill as I understand it, be faced with the problem of making a decision ultimately about the effectiveness of the employee. That is he will, at some point in time, be faced with trying to determine whether the employee's age, in fact, is mitigating against his effectiveness as an



employee and perhaps making a subjective...even..... judgment on that basis. The employee, I would suspect, would be reluctant at any time to feel that he was getting to the age where perhaps his capabilities were reduced. Now, my question to you has to be, will.....does this not put the employer in a very difficult position in regard to that determination? And, is he then subject to possible suits saying that he let so and so go on the basis simply of age?"

Greiman: "Well, let me say this...firstly....this Bill does not want to force mediocrity on any employer. The same judgments that apply to a worker who is sixty-eight should apply to a worker who is forty-eight or twenty-eight or eighteen, as a matter of fact. Sixty-five.... you may be interested to know that sixty-five percent of the employees who are hired by mandatory retirement employers want to retire. They are happy to retire. They have made their plans. They've done their life on that and they are happy to retire. So we're talking about a small percentage who want to continue to work. Now, I should tell you that United States Steel, as an example of a big company, its one hundred and fifty-two thousand employees are not under a mandatory retirement plan. They work until.....as long as they are able to work and as long as the management thinks they can work. They have a strong union as well as a strong employer. And yet they have no problems with it. Banker's Life is a sophisticated kind of an organization, they have no mandatory retirement plan. Both did and they scratched them, they scratched them because they can live with them because there are sophisticated tests that will tell the employer who is mediocre and who is not and who can do the work and who cannot. To have mandatory retirements is the.....it's the tool of a lazy personnel director. Industry can live with it and American society must live with it.



Hudson: "Well, as far as U. S. Steel, isn't it true that that is not universal throughout U. S. Steel, it applies to one category of workers?"

Greiman: "One hundred and fifty-two thousand out of one hundred and seventy-one thousand employees are covered.....do not have mandatory retirement. I'm told they are considering dropping it for the additional nineteen thousand that are left."

Hudson: "So what you are saying then that that's a voluntary program that U. S. Steel is under. Is that an argument for voluntary concept in this?"

Greiman: "No, I think it is merely saying that if an industry like United States Steel can live with it, most other companies can live with it."

Hudson: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Might I address the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Wikoff: "...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm in complete sympathy with what the Bill tends to do, but I must oppose it for this reason. I think it's another means of just piling regulations upon regulations upon our presentbusiness environment that we have. I think this is something that the government really has no business meddling in. This should be a private situation between the employee and their employers and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Al, I have some problems with the existing contractual negotiations as you well know, but I have a question in form of a possible situation. If, in fact, your legislation was to be enacted, and someone was retained on the job at sixty-five, sixty-six or sixty-seven and then was laid off at sixty-seven, that person, in my estimation, since the Supplemental Assistance Act,



under Unemployment Compensation goes into effect. What would he file under? Would he go back to Social Security and Pension or would he be also eligible for the new Federal benefits under 'UC'?"

Greiman: "I'm really not certain. I don't know what to tell you. I really don't know."

Mautino: "I think, in my estimation, with the new benefits in Federal formula, that anyone laid off without a cap on that particular segment of society, would be ...would come under the umbrella of the benefits for eternity, I think. And I think it's going to be a problem since that rate may go up to one hundred and fifty-two bucks per employee."

Greiman: "I don't have the answer to it. I'm not sure that it's relevant in terms of protection of employment. You know...that's sort of after employment. You know, it's not really relevant as to who is employed but who is unemployed."

Mautino: "Well, I think it is relevant because at some point in time that person will be leaving that employ, whether it be at sixty-five, sixty-seven or sixty-eight or seventy. But, I think it is a question that has to be addressed."

Greiman: "I think it depends too on what he is fired for. You know, if he is laid off because he can't do the job, that is one thing. If he is laid off for age, it's another thing entirely."

Mautino: "But if he is laid off at sixty-six or sixty-seven, which your Bill would get rid of....it seems to me he would be also ...be able to collect 'UC' benefits at the top end, which could be a more ...more of a financial burden,..let's say, as a state employee, because we would come under that same auspices."

Greiman: "I'm not sure....I mean....I don't know the answer, frankly. You know, I just don't know the answer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."



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

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Gaines: "How many complaints do you feel this would generate
.....per year?"

Greiman: "Well, the fair Employment Commission filed a fiscal note and said that they had a ...they thought it would be a very minimal impact in the early years. I have no way of telling. I don't think it's going to be a big impact at all. I think it is a directional thing for society and I don't think there is going to be a lot of litigation...frankly, on it... at all. I really don't."

Greiman: " May I address myself to the Bill, Mr. Speaker?..... This Bill adds another group to those who we pay protection under the Fair Employment Practices Commission. As a sponsor of their budget Bill, I certainly want to join Representative Davis in admonishing this Body..... that whenever you add a new group, particularly a very active group, those who are already employed, rather than those seeking employment, the number of complaints in my opinion, would rise appreciably. I will have to insist on asking for a higher appropriation to cover these new complaints which I am quite sure will come aboard. So I want you to know that if this Bill passes I intend to vote for it, but it also means an increase in the budget for the FEPC."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

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

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

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In 1975 this Bill passed out of this House with 119 affirmative votes. At that time in 1975, the then House Bill 128 was the first kind of legislation as this any place in the country. We are now joined in Congress by Representative Findley's Bill,



Which seeks to do the same thing on the federal level. New York, California, Montana, Pennsylvania and a half dozen other states are now entertaining the same kind of legislation. Americans are living longer, are living healthier. They are stronger. They are able to live and work and be productive for much longer time. If the reason for all of the public health that we have has anything...has any meaning, then it's to keep people as productive and youthful citizens. I ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you."

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

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm voting 'aye' for this Bill. ...Notwithstanding a fear that it may be an act of futility. It were as though we were turning back the clock and hands of time. Perhaps it's as though we were passing a law against growing old or even dying, but the reason that I am voting 'aye' is; in this country or in this state, the word 'ethnic' today is almost as dead as the dodo bird. It's on its last legs. Paternalistic society has weakened it to a point that the people who really want to work are not very many. You can see examples everywhere you turn. Note the 'snow days' last winter here in Springfield in that regard...for state employees. So I say to you that if there is any group that wants to work ...God Bless them...Let's make their path a little easier by voting 'aye' for Greiman's good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. speaker. Just briefly to explain my vote. This may, in the long run, if it in fact becomes law....may be the most inhumane piece of legislation that we are considering this Session. You think of the problems that we have in regard to...well, just take



the human cry for example that we have in regard to 40.
 tenure in the teaching profession. At least there is
 a cutoff point and everybody knows it. The employers
 and the employees and from that year on they go on to a
 one year basis of contract. This again also is another
 example of the government putting their nose in private
 business contracts. I think that we will rue the day
 when we have done this and it's for that reason I vote
 'no'."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to explain my 'present' vote. I don't believe that it's proper for us to permit discrimination by the state or units of local government...as regards people...and because of the Amendment #2 I'm voting 'present', although I do support the concept here. I think we should make it across the board. I think that people should be permitted to work...whatever their age....for anybody...if they otherwise qualify."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr.....(Microphone failure)...of the House, I think this is a very humane Bill. I think there's ...very cogent reasons why the local governments of the state cannot be brought into it at this time. It doesn't start till 1980 and I certainly think we should go by the character and the ability of a person rather than by their age. If they are able to do a job they certainly should be allowed to work instead of being put out to pasture as is so often done here and it's high time we're mindful of older people's rights too."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'aye' and 30 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 80.....Representative Deuster."



Clerk O'Brien: House Bill 80, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Highway Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 80 is accurately described in the Synopsis. It is a permissive Bill. This simply allows our counties, if they wish, to develop and adopt reasonable rules and regulations relating to the supports for mailboxes. Strangely enough, in Lake County, you could call this the 'Dangerous Mailbox Bill'. In Lake County we have some people who, with reckless disregard for the safety of others, have constructed mailbox supports made out of steel beams. I have at my desk photographs of accidents that have occurred. The Department of Transportation indicates actually....two years ago we had about 263 accidents and four fatalities involving mailboxes....one way or another. Although this is a localized problem, this in order not to involve the state in it....the Bill simply permits a county to regulate the safety of the mailbox supports ... if they want to. It came out of the Transportation Committee 18 to nothing. I would urge your favorable support for the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, Representative McMaster..."

McMaster: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

McMaster: "Don, don't we already have federal postal regulations in regard to mailboxes and mailbox supports? I know at different times our mailman....has left a note in the box saying that your mailbox isn't big enough or your support isn't right or it should be on the other side of the road and.....and ...ah...I just wonder if we are making overlapping jurisdiction in this. I understand it's permissible....of course."



Deuster: "No, to my knowledge we're not. This Bill was presented at the request of the Lake County Highway Superintendent. The state law does give authority to the Department of Transportation, our State Department of Transportation, to regulate the aspects of the mailboxes ...even on county roads...But not with respect to the supports. The state is not interested in getting into the subject of supports but the county is. This would just allow them....I'm not aware, Tom, of any federal regulation on that.....subject."

McMaster: "Okay. Thank you, Don."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have the greatest admiration for the Sponsor of this Bill but I'd like to say that in this day and age everybody is up to their.... 'eyeballs' in governmental regulations. Why in the world we shouldpermissive or otherwise.....open up the important area of describing and regulating the way somebody's mailbox is fastened to the ground....is beyond me. I'm going to vote 'present' on this Bill. I can't see, for the life of me, why we should entangle our citizens in more red tape and create new vast regulatory powers in local government."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Would the Press Corp be quiet? Representative Weddell."

Waddell: "Don, does your Bill provide that that same individual that wanted that authority.....replace those mailboxes when his county snowplows come along and knock them all off?"

Deuster: "No.....No, it does not. Our Lake County Highway Superintendent, Ed Street, is a good professional. He is interested in safety. I have here, Representative Waddell, photographs of what happened to a car....going along one



of our roads....tried to pull over to the side.....ran into one of these steel pillars. You know, it's one thing to have an artistic mailbox, another thing to have a steel piling in the ground. If we respect the common sense of our local government, I hope the people..... if the people in Lake County or any other county feel that they don't want the County Board controlling this great freedom of theirs they could just not adopt the regulation. This is permissive. No cost to the state. If they don't want to exercise it they don't have to."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland."

Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the previous question."

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

Deuster: "The Synopsis describes the Bill. I'll thank you for your favorable support. I think this is a safety Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Like to call the Members attention to the fact that in some of the Roll Calls that we've had I've noticed that Members have been voted who are not in their seat. Some of them were very....very controversial matters. If I notice it again, I'm going to call off the name of the Member who is I just don't think it is fair to our colleagues to vote them on something that may get them into trouble. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 39 'aye' and 42 'no' and the Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed..... Representative Telcser.....LOST.....Pardon me. Representative Telcser, I understand that you want your series of



Condominium Property Bills taken out of the record. Is that correct? Out of the record...134 through 154. One five seven...."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steihl....Out of the record. Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. How about 158? Out too? Two one two. Ever-ready Totten."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 212, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 212 addresses itself to the penalty provisions for welfare fraud. Many of us, of course, look with alarm at the increasing....not only fraud but the cost of our public aid Bills in this state. House Bill 212 attempts to address itself specifically at some of the fraud provisions by changing the present provisions in the code and stratifying the penalties for fraud by classification of fraud by dollar amount. It also provides, which prosecuting State's Attorneys have indicated to me and to the Committee, another important feature, that is the feature that should someone supply fraudulent material or fraudulent information to a recipient, presently the State's Attorneys or the Department are unable to prosecute for fraud. This Bill would provide that should anyone provide fraudulent information the Department and State's Attorneys may prosecute under fraud provisions. In Missouri, which recently enacted similar fraud legislation, they estimate that the Department of Public Aid, through the prosecuting attorneys, may accumulate anywhere from nine and a half million to nineteen million dollars in fraud because of the ability to prosecute under more strict penalties as provided in House Bill 212. I'd be happy to try and answer any questions and I solicit your favorable vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of our major drains of our Welfare Department, of course, is in terms of fraud. I think we've all read the daily papers con.....constantly, indicating how money is taken away from our taxpayers through that Department. If raising the penalties will add to the deterrence of this type of crime, I would concur with the Sponsor of this Bill and support this effort."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was heard in the Committee on which I serve on. The testimony presented by the State's Attorneys present was that this would be an effective tool in fighting welfare fraud in counties of the State of Illinois. I commend Representative Totten on this Bill and urge an 'aye' vote on this piece of legislation."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I just ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 128 'aye' and 5 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Two two seven. Representative Miller."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 227, a Bill for an Act to provide additional financing for the Local Governmental Law Enforcement Officers Fund, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins seeks unanimous consent to be recorded as voting 'aye', is that correct? Representative Martin, same request. Representative Breslin, same request. Representative Macdonald, same request. Representative McCourt, same request. Representative



Darrow, same request. Representative Harris, same request. Representative Bennett, same request. Representative McAvoy, same request. Representative Ewing, same request. Representative Greiman, same request. Representative Miller, 227."

Miller: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 227, Cosponsored by Representative John Matijevich and I, amends the Local Governmental Law Enforcement Training Act by providing for a penalty assessment on certain traffic and criminal fines to fully fund the mandatory police training program we have in our state today. As you recall.....last year we imposed upon our local government a mandatory requirement for training our policemen.... And for the past twelve years the state and local governments have shared on a fifty-fifty basis the cost of training our policemen. This add on penalty on traffic and criminal fines is expected to generate between five and six million dollars per year. It will relieve the state of about a little over two million dollars of general revenue funding and relieve our local government of their fifty percent of the cost. This program is a program that has been adopted in several other states. Most notably...California, where they generate about thirteen million dollars of revenue by the add on fee in traffic and criminal fines. The Bill is strongly supported by the Taxpayers Federation, the Illinois Municipal League, numerous police groups throughout the state and I ask your favorable vote on behalf of House Bill 227."

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

Houlihan, D.L.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to speak in opposition to the Bill which I think is well intentioned but I'm afraid it's going to have a practical effect that is going to be very severe on the motorists of this state. What I'd like to point out is that the Illinois Supreme Court has recently



adopted a revised schedule of fines in traffic cases, which will become effectiveit's either June 1 or July 1. These call for rather substantial increases in what have generally been regarded as minor traffic violations. Additionally; last year the General Assembly provided that for costs payable in a traffic violation case, increased costs to the Circuit Court of a flat rate ten dollars. Now....here in this Bill we have another surcharge over and above the fine and the cause. I suggest that we start looking at this because we're going to be talking about....upon a finding of guilty for running a red light....somewhere in the neighborhood of a sixty dollar fine for that type of a case. I think that is a real problem as far as what the effect of this Bill will have. I think in voting we have to realize the effect that this is going to have on the ordinary motorist and in consequence I am urging a 'no' vote on the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "I certainly am for having the best training that the policemen can get. I rise in opposition to the Bill, not for what Houlihan says but I used the word 'creature' of the General Assembly many times when I refer to municipalities. We are really becoming creatures of the General Assembly when we start mandating these programs and then after we accept them thinking we're getting a free lunch, we find out that in a couple of years they're mandating something else. I have to change my complete radio system, my complete ...communications system.... because I started this program and I entered this program and I was threatened that it would be cut off unless I continued to accept the mandates that this General Assembly keeps giving these municipalities. I'm not against training the policemen but I'm certainly against having mandates put on these municipalities and then coming back with some more strings two or three years later. I'm



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

going to have to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of Mr....."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Giorgi: ".....Miller. How much is the extra surcharge going to be on disobeying a traffic signal or a left turn lane? How much surcharge is there going to be over that?"

Miller: "Representative Giorgi, I'm not familiar with what the particular fine might be but assuming that is a thirty dollar fine, the add on fee in the twenty to forty dollar category would be a four dollar add on fee. Typically, this add on fee will average up at about thirteen or fourteen percent."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I think the Taxpayers Federation that you said endorsed this Bill, and the Illinois Municipal League that you said endorsed this Bill, and the various police organizations ought to be ashamed of themselves for introducing this type of legislation. What this is going to do.....if a fellow sneaks a stoplight or misses a left turn lane or doesn't have a light...light shining over his license plate, he is going to be subject for a fifty or sixty dollar fine and ten percent so that the troopers can go to school to learn to write more tickets, and the crime rate escalates. The people aren't safe in their homes; they aren't safe in the communities; they aren't safe in the parks...so that the policemen can become one big speed trap sorter. I think it is an insult to our intelligence and an insult to the people of the State of Illionois to introduce a Bill such as this. If you can't afford to train the police officers to go out and apprehend a criminal you ought to be ashamed of yourself and go back into your hole."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones. Emil Jones."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."



Jones, Emil: "Representative Miller, when was the last time you were at traffic court in the City of Chicago?"

Miller: "Representative Jones, I walk by there about once a week."

Jones, Emil: "Have you ever been inside?"

Miller: "Yes, I have, about fifteen years ago."

Jones, Emil: "Well, I happened to have been there this past Monday. For your information. After you see the number of people that are there you would think that these were the only people that committed crimes in the City of Chicago. Am I correct?"

Miller: "No. I wouldn't agree to your statement that those are the only people that commit crimes in the City of Chicago. But the essence of this Bill of course is that the law violator pays for our police training. What's wrong with that?"

Jones, Emil: "Mr. Speaker, I address myself to the legislation itself."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Jones, Emil: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if ever there was a bad piece of legislation, House Bill 227 is that piece of legislation. I happened to be in the traffic court in the City of Chicago just this past Monday. And to see the people there, you would think that only one group of people could.....would commit a traffic offense in the City of Chicago. This is bad legislation. I'm surprised to see my good friend, Tom Miller, Sponsor this type of Bill. This Bill should be resoundly defeated. After it is defeated I will talk with my colleague on the other side of the aisle because this Bill is aimed at....not to help a given situation, but it will hurt the majority of the people and it should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker,and my friends on both sides of the aisle, I think my position in terms of law



enforcement is well known. I think my position in supporting the police services of this state is well known. But I think also, that most of us campaigned on a ...no tax increase basis...including hidden taxes. Now...when the police department of all the people of the State of Illinois has to be funded by a narrow segment of our society, I am certainly opposed. This is a problem for all of the people. If funds are necessary for the programs that are instituted....come up with the proper appropriation Bill, divide the cost of that appropriation over all the people of Illinois because they get these services. Don't have the poor and the indigent and the people who are unlucky enough not to see a left turn signal..... pick up their tab. This is hidden taxation and it violates our entire concept. This offends me. It offends me in the name of the people and I'm certainly against this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the name of the people I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye'.....'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Miller to close."

Miller: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker.....and Members of the House.....yield to my..."

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

Matijevich: "...I'm going to close. I'm going to take the bombardments that I heard. I heard some of the comments about this just being a small segment of the people picking up the tab and from all I heard it is not a small segment. Just about everybody gets a ticket. So evidently it's not a small segment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Miller to close..."

Matijevich: "....No....I'm closing."



Speaker Redmond: "Turn him on.."

Matijevich: "I'm sorry. I'm closing, Mr. Speaker. But..... really, this is actually a truth in funding Bill. It's nothing new, really....In all the comments that we hear from all the people opposed to this Bill, California has had this in operation and they've generated many funds for law enforcement. Now....many...many times on the floor of this House...and every day I pickup the newspapers....all I hear, especially this Session....is that this Legislature is for law enforcement. For law enforcement. That we're all for better policemen and for more law protection. But nobody will put their money where their mouth is. They say that because it means votes. But what we really must do is to back that up with the funds. Now....I noticed that the Governor has a Commission on state mandated programs. That's another thing I hear a lot about. That we're all opposed to state mandated programs if we don't correlate those state mandated programs with funds. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you mandated...you mandated through mandatory Legislation.....that we have police training. You put that burden on local government. You put the burdens there but you didn't put the funds there. All that House Bill 227 does ...it says that we are finding a vehicle.....a vehicle for funds....And it has worked in California....and it is bringing in many funds in California I think to the tune of about twelve million dollars. This will generate the funds and in the Committee, we beckon to all of those who had opposition to it....and we've tried in every way to cooperate with them so that they would benefit by the Bill. Now with all of that.... I think we have a good Bill. We're putting our funds where our mouths have been and that's not always easy to do but I think Ladies and Gentlemen it's about time we do it and if you do you are voting for House Bill 227."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Miller.....to close."

Miller: "Well....Mr. Speaker, that was the closing argument on behalf of both of us in Sponsoring the Bill. Let me point out that this same Bill came out with 117 to one Roll Call vote last time."

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

Taylor: "I just wanted to inform you that Representative Matijevich had closed and I would like to speak on the Bill in terms of explaining my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich usually calls everybody to order but we had put the previous question and it had carried and we went to Representative Miller and I thought the House was on fire and Representative Matijevich got recognition. So Representative Miller was the principle Sponsor of this Bill and I called on him to close.....The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Taylor to explain his vote."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, it appears that I may not have to explain my vote. The red lights are showing up as I think they should. But....I know that police training is training for all of the people of the State of Illinois and I feel that all of the people should be involved in paying the taxation and not discriminate such as this Bill is doing. I therefore urge all of the Members to vote 'no' on House Bill 227."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I'd just like to indicate to those of you that drive I-55 that the Sheriff in Sherman is bad enough. Don't give him any additional incentive by passing this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm sure the Sponsors of these Bills have good intent."



But I know all of you have heard the charge that policemen must write so many tickets. Haven't you heard those charges? I don't know whether they are true or not. But the general public believes that they must write so many tickets. Now listen to what this says there. This is an Act to provide additional financing for local governmental law enforcement offices. Isn't this an inducement for policemen and law enforcement officers to write additional tickets? Isn't it an inducement? I know you want to get rid of that. That's why I'm voting 'no'. It will not serve the purpose for which you think it will."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 61 'aye' and 82 'no' and the Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. I'd like to introduce a former Member. Representative Saal. Representative Saal. He has the unique he took my seat one time. I....He had one more term than I did and I wasn't too sure and when I went to choose my seat I found that George had taken it and I saw him come up here a little bit ago and I don't know whether he was going to take this one or not. But he was going to get it over my dead body. Representative...Former Representative George Saal. Two three zero. Representative Lucco. Lucco.."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to introduce a group of students in the gallery from the Blessed Sacrament School, District #10. This district is served by Representatives Shumpert, Madison and Molloy. Shumpert's daughter attends this school...and the principal of the Blessed Sacrament School is the sister of Representative Tom Miller. The students from Blessed Sacrament."

Speaker Redmond: "Two three zero, Representative Sevcik."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 230, a Bill for an Act prohibiting employment in this state of aliens who are in the United States illegally, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sevcik."

Sevcik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill has passed the two previous Sessions and at one time it was declared unconstitutional in the State of California, but since 1976, the Federal Supreme Court has reversed the California decision and stated that the states may pass laws dealing with the employment of illegal aliens. I want to say that this Bill is a combined Bill of Representative Cal Skinner and various Cosponsors and passed the Labor and Commerce Commission Committee 17 to nothing. This Bill requires employers to obtain documentary proof of legal aliens or citizenship from prospective applicants for employment. It also provides penalties for the employers and the employees if they present fictitious certificates of citizenship. I think we are all familiar with this Bill and I 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 wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Byers. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 113 'aye' and 12 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Two four four. Representative Kozubowski requests permission to be voted 'aye'. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 244, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing. Two four four, out of the record. Two fifty-one, Deuster. Out of the record. Three zero two, Van Duyne. Three zero two."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 302, a Bill for an Act to prevent indigent defendants from securing counsel other than the public defender, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill is, as the Clerk read, it amends the Public Defender Act and the Criminal Procedure Act and it prohibits individual indigent defendants from requesting counsel other than the public defender.....at the state's expense.....in cases involving multiple defendants. In cases where they have a previous adverse relationship. The net result of the Bill is simply that the defendant must force the judge to make a judgment and come to some kind of a decision as to why there is mitigating circumstances that he should not have a public defender. Just claiming to be an indigent is not sufficient reason. Now this is an attempt to stop the so-called indigents from claiming that the public defenders are incompetent attorneys..... and demanding an attorney of their own choice. The supporters of this Bill claim that the public defenders have passed the test and are members of the same Bar Association as all the rest of the attorneys practicing in the State of Illinois. Today's law guarantees that the defendant's equality.....guarantees the defendant's equality under the law and due process.....but in no way infers or guarantees counsel of their choice. It just simply is not the obligation of the people of the State of Illinois. This was passed out of the Judiciary Committee 14 to nothing. We have added an Amendment to the Bill that would allow the judge to give the so-called indigents their private attorney where there were mitigating circumstances. I just simply ask for your affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Dan Houlihan. Representative Houlihan.
.....Representative Dan Houlihan."



Houlihan, Dan: "I have a question of the Sponsor, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Houlihan, Dan: "The Amendment is the Bill. Is that correct, Representative Van Duyne?"

Van Duyne: "Yes."

Houlihan, Dan: "How does this change what is the existing law in respect to appointment of counsel....other than the public defender?"

Van Duyne: "Well, it just forces the judge to make a finding. Heretofore, the defendants have come up with some sort of a slang expression to the effect that we want a real lawyer rather than a public defender. They have made all kinds of claims ...claiming discrimination...whatever. And so the net result of the Bill, Dan, is just to force the judge to come to some kind of a finding. I hope to have another Amendment put on this in the Senate, at Representative Harold Katz's behest, to force the judge to make this finding in writing. It just simply isn't enough in my mind to claim that you are an indigent and to say, 'Well, I want a private attorney'. This Bill... the idea came from the 'Embattled Eleven'....that I'm sure you are all aware of....a couple of years ago, where it cost the State of Illinois, through the Department of Corrections, two hundred thousand dollars to defend the ...these people called the 'Embattled Eleven' of the Stateville Penitentiary. As I say, it's a lot of conference and confab here to just simply state that it just forces the judge to come up with some kind of finding. If there are circumstances that would jeopardize the defendant, the judge still has the right to appoint the private counsel."

Houlihan, Dan: "But as I read your amended Bill, the only finding that the court can make to entitle the defendant to counsel, other than the public defender, is a finding that appointment of the public defender would be



prejudicial to the rights of the defendant? Is that correct?"

Van Duynes: "Yeah. That has to do....where there has some type of adverse relationship between the defendant and the appointed public defender."

Houlihan, Dan: "Well....what about multiple defendants where the public defender would be in a conflict position.... representing..because of antagonistic defenses."

Van Duynes: "That's right. That would be one of the findings the judge would have the prerogative of coming to. Now....really, we're not trying to jeopardize this defendant. If there is mitigating circumstances and some kind of an adverse relationship we still....in the Bill and in the Amendment also it gives the judge a prerogative of appointing a counsel. But it does force the judge to come to some kind of a finding. It does make it a little bit tougher for these people to claim that they are being discriminated against or that there is some kind of an adverse relationship. You know, it just makes it just a little tougher if somebody gets....."

Houlihan, Dan: "No further questions...."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye' and 15 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Three zero seven, Representative Holewinski. Representative Marovitz, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to be recorded 'no' on House Bill 230. It will not change the outcome. There was 112 'ayes'. I'd like to be changed from 'aye' to 'no'....It was inadvertent on my part."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested leave to be



recorded as voting 'no' on 230. Any objection? Hearing none. Leave is granted. Representative Holewinski."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 307..."

Speaker Redmond: "Holewinski.....Out of the record....Request of the Sponsor. Three one four. Representative Stearney."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 314, a Bill for an Act to provide for permissive application of bail against such assessments, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 314 represents a joint effort between Representatives Ray Ewell, LeRoy Van Duyne and myself, to answer a pressing need. This Bill here would provide that whenever a defendant, who has been admitted to bail, utilizes the services of a public defender, the amount deposited may be used to reimburse the county funding the defender services. In effect, the Bill would do this; any individual posting a cash bond and then having a public defender represent them, the court may, at the disposition of the case, levy a reasonable attorney fee and pay that money over to the County Treasurer who furnished the public defender. To that individual criminal defendant. This Bill passed the General Assembly last year, however, it failed to pass the Senate. So I am asking once again for a favorable Roll Call on this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this BillRepresentative Lechowicz..."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Lechowicz: "What are the possible costs....what is the maximum cost that could be leveled against a defendant?"

Stearney: "The matter is left within the discretion of the judge."



Lechowicz: "Do you know how many cases we have in Cook County, that would qualify for this?"

Stearney: "Thousands....Thousands, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "And the cost would bethe cost could be level-
ed by the judge....respective back to the individual or
his family?"

Stearney: "No, just the cost may be levied....and assessed
against the bail bond that he has posted. Nothing more."

Lechowicz: "And the bail bond is normally posted by that
individual or by members of his family? Is that correct?"

Stearney: "The bond is posted by the individual defendant and
if you were to look at a bond it is in the individual
defendant's name with his address. That bond is returned
to the individual defendant, not anyone else. The Circuit
Court Clerk's Office has no way of knowing who else that
bond money may belong to."

Lechowicz: "Let me tell you that I get calls on a Friday or
a Saturday night posting bond for a lot of people....out
of my Ward that maybe don't have the money to post that
bond. What I'm saying though, if this Bill goes into
effect, they can assess the cost against the bond and in
turn you'll never see your money back. Is that correct?"

Stearney: "Would you re.....well, if the costs are assessed
and levied against the bond the moneys will be paid over
to the County Treasurer who furnished those services."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian....Representative
Madison..."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Madison: "Representative Stearney, would this assessment be
placed whether or not there was a finding of guilt or
innocence?"

Stearney: "Yes."

Madison: "Then you're telling me ifif a defendant got a



....a...false arrest and he had to use a public defender and the verdict was not guilty. He had to post a bond, he would still have to pay the cost, even though he was not guilty?"

Stearney: "It's within the discretion of the judge, however, that instance in which you have a false arrest is ...the exception and not the rule, Representative Madison."

Madison: "Well, whether it's the exceptionof the rule, Representative Stearney, I wouldn't want to be the exception, that's the problem that I've got with the Bill...and I don't think anybody else would..."

Stearney: "Well true that's why...I provided.....true, Representative. Last year I passed this Bill and I used the word 'shall'. This Bill, however, in this Session uses the word 'may'....the court 'may' impose that....'may' assess that.....fee. It's within the discretion of the court after hearing the facts on that particular matter."

Madison: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I generally am one of the Members of the House who supports Stearney and most of the stuff that he tries.....but in this Bill....what you are going to do isyou are going to clog the courts worse than they are now. As soon as some of the families around my Winnebago County are caught I'll find out that the poor widow or the sister or the brother who put up five hundred dollars or a thousand dollar bond and that bond was taken to pay for the lawyer's fee, the word is going to get out and our courts are going to be clogged five times as great as they are now because nobody can put.....any bond up and we're going to be then hearing crying for more judges, more courtrooms, more public defenders, more State's Attorneys. This Bill isa very...very poor Bill....I'm sorry for you Mr. Stearney."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to point out to the Members of this House that, you know, we're talking about a person who is arrested and brought into court and he claims indigency. We're not talking about a person who pays his own bond, who hires his own lawyer. I don't see any reason why a person brought into court who is legally an indigent...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters tells me he can't hear. Please be quiet. Proceed, Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "If I am arrested and brought into court and forced to defend myself by hiring a lawyer and also put up my own bond, my bond is not...my court appearance and my legal counsel is not paid by the citizens of Illinois. I don't believe any man who claims indigency, who is flat broke and goes into court and gets the mercy of the court and is appointed a public defender to defend him, and then goes and contradicts his claim of indigency and posts a bond to get out of jail, should stand there and claim some kind of discrimination, or some kind of
...ah...well, unfair treatment. If he claims indigency and then posts a bond he is...he contradicts his own statement and I believe we have already...already have rules enforced that allow the bonds to be attached for clerk's fees et cetera. I really don't see where this man or this person is being discriminated against and I would hope 'for God's sake' that we get some common sense into our heads and pass this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support Representative Stearney on this Bill. Many times I have gone to court and seen people who were supposed to be broke come in and post fifteen hundred or two thousand dollar bonds. The taxpayers are picking up their tab for their lawyers. This is a way of getting



back at the professional criminals who are ripping the people off constantly. I certainly am in support of Representative Stearney's Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of this measure. I think what you have to do is read the Bill in order to truly understand it. You can't just listen to the discussion, you've got to look at the Bill. All it simply does....it says that a judge maymay in his discretion....assess part of the cost or the whole cost against the bond....and that is the bond of the defendant, for the particular action. What we're doing is attempting to plug some loopholes where some professional criminals constantly use the public defender's office while crying 'broke' ...while saying they don't have any money to support the particular case and we're saying that in the discretion of the court...it ought to be permissible. This Bill will mean that you, the Members of the Legislature, will not be asked to put up such huge sums in order to pay for public defenders and public defender programs throughout the state. We're simply shifting the cost of crime, the cost of the particular matter back to some of the people who deserve to have the punishment. I think it's ironic that as a traffic violator you're certain to carry the burden of the court system, whereas, if you practice criminal law, that is you are a criminal, you can certainly evade the entire cost of all the litigation and the entire cost of court and have it borne by the consumer. It's a reasonable Bill. It's a good Bill. I would urge the support of the Members of the House."

Speake Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hate to disagree with my learned colleague from my district. But there are many occasions where friends and neighbors put up a bond for a person who has been arrested....."



because many times these persons are thrown into county jailswhich you know are the worst jails in the world according to the Federal Government, and we feel that it would stop a lot of people from going to the aid of their neighbor....I'm not talking about the professional crook. They are in the minority. The majority of the people arrested are not the professional crook. They are people who got into trouble inadvertently and they may or they may not be guilty. A lot of times friends will put up a bond for someone.....but they would not pay their fine. I think everyone should have to pay their own fine. But I think that someone...a neighbor, a friend, or clergyman ...may put up a bond so the gentleman may be out or the woman may be out so that she can have an adequate trial. I think that when you threaten that, you are taking away.....really their right to be on bond. I think that is one thing that I personally have put up bond for neighbors and for neighbors kids and gotten it back and I certainly would not do it if I thought that it was going to be assessed if the person were found guilty. So therefore, I'm going to ask you to vote 'no'.

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney to close."

Stearney: "Well....Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is meant to correct a serious abuse that we have in our public defender system. The counties are now paying to implement a public defender system in which we have criminal defendants abusing it. I've seen instances in Cook County where an individual, a defendant, has posted five hundred, a thousand, or fifteen hundred dollars in cash and then has had the public defender's office defend him. Then at the end of the case he gets all of his money back. Well...the public defender's office was not set up to represent individuals of that sort. It is meant to represent



indigents and indigents, I might remind you, get out on their personal recognizance bond in many instances. This Bill is meant to remedy a serious problem and I'd say, especially to those people downstate, that come from smaller counties, your public defender system is growing by leaps and bounds. The reason being is that individual criminals are coming in poor-mouthing it and then asking them to have the public defender represent them when they know the case is either going to go out on a search and seizure motion or they were apprehended and they were guilty. So they believe that why should they pay for it when they can get the public the general public to pick up the cost of their criminal defense. It's about time that we begin to end the process of subsidizing crime. This is one measure of implementing that proposal. I ask for a favorable Roll Call on that vote. "

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'aye' and 28 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Three one eight...Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,the principal Sponsor of this piece of legislation is Representative Dyer and she is ill and asked me if I would attempt to clear the Calendar and move the legislation. What House Bill 318 does is..... it merely increases the size of the membership in the State Scholarship Commission from seven to nine and the Digest is very accurate in what it says. It would beone....the student member....and I would like to say that as far as student membership, it would have all privileges afforded any board member....Commission member



would bethey are present on all the governing boards related to higher education.....except the Illinois State Scholarship Commission....and, inasmuch, as that Department has something like one hundred and four million dollars that it handles...during the fiscal year 1978 and the decisions of the Commission itself really directly affect the well-being of about ninety-five thousand students in this particular area.....It has the support of the Student Government Association and it was well received in the Commission.....er.....the Committee on Higher Education, of which I am a member. It also adds, in order to keep an odd number of membership on their, one individual who is chosen for....that has some knowledge and interest in higher education but not employed by an institution of higher learning and I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 318, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Further Discussion? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order... I hear a couple of Representatives talking. Representative Laurino. Representative Kozubowski, will you please give the Gentleman order? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Good work, Mr. Speaker. I rise reluctantly to oppose House Bill 318 and Representatives Ebbesen and Dyer. This Bill would not just give student membership to the Scholarship Commission, but it would very significantly also give that student a vote on the Scholarship Commission. Heretofore, we have put students on the various..... boards....Junior College Board of Regents, Board of Governors, et cetera, but they have not been permitted to vote. I have opposed the student membership on the board



since, in my opinion, it does absolutely nothing but aggrandize one single student and that ...really is nothing. I have no objection at all to advisory boards consisting of students that advise these boards and commissions but to have students as members ...is just simply not right.....to have them as voting members makes absolutely no sense at all.....I urge the defeat of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As in the case of Representative Walsh, I also reluctantly rise to oppose this Bill. I discussed it at length with Representative Dyer. We attempted to work out a compromise that would still give the students and their interests, voice...on the board. But as far as going to a vote, I think it's an extremely bad precedent to set. I think we make a mistake when we give students voting membership on any of these boards having to do with higher education. An extension of the logic of putting a student on...because they represent a specific constituency...would be on the governing board. That next the faculties will want a direct and voting representativeThen the civil service people will want a direct and voting representativeThen the maintenance people will want a direct and voting representative...It seems to me that the end is not in sight. I think it's probably of dubious value but it probably does no damage to put a student on in an advisory capacity. But when you give them the vote I think that this Legislature has gone much too far and I strongly solicit a negative vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like a little bit of clarification here and point out to the Membership of the House that when we heard this Bill



before the Higher Education Committee, the State Scholarship Commission was represented there and at that time they were in support of House Bill 318. That support is still with House Bill 318 and they did point out rather aptly that some of the mistakes that they had made in the past have been pointed out by the students and they felt that there would be a much...much more equitable and better situation all the way around with the passage and eventual signature of the Governor of House Bill 318."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Ebbesen to close."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that everyone knows the issue and I would just encourage everyone to give these students what they ask. I think that....as Representative McGrew has just pointed out, that they make a very valuable contribution. If they are going to make a valuable contribution in this area ...I don't necessarily see why it should always be advisory. I think that their input is appreciated and necessary and I would appreciate a favorable reaction....a positive vote on this House Bill 318."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 117 'aye' and 29 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Three twenty-two..... Representative Beatty."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 322, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a merely Bill. It is just a judgment creditor in collecting for the damage to his car after a judgment. The requirement under the law...that the Secretary of State revoke the



license in this situation. This accords the opportunity and the Clerk has the requirement, with this Bill, of notifying the Secretary of State when there has been a judgment entered. It leaves the plaintiff, who got the judgment, it gives him the opportunity to say to the court, 'Please notify the Secretary of State'. Then they have to notify the Secretary of State and then he can get some action and perhaps collect his damage or the gentleman who caused the damage will lose his license. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Beatty: "Yes."

Schlickman: "Aren't you shifting a burden from the Clerk of the Court, to the plaintiff, in a matter?"

Beatty: "Well, in a sense, I think you're right on this Gene, but as a practical matter, in Cook County, the Clerk doesn't act anyway unless there's a petition filed by the plaintiff's attorney. So it's really putting into codification....what's really being done....particularly in Cook County."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it seems to me that we are compounding the burden of the average citizen of this state and we're doing it under the color of providing for more efficient operations of local government. The law presently says that when there has been a judgment entered, the Clerk of the Court and the judge, if the particular court has no clerk, shall immediately forward to the Secretary of State, a record of that judgment. Now....under this Bill we're relieving the clerk or the judge of providing that information, that material, to the Secretary of State and imposing upon the plaintiff, who may or may not know what the law



is. I think, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that not only in shifting a burden.....and what's government all about after all.....but to serve people, but shifting the burden from local government to the plaintiff will not only compound the average citizen's problems, knowing what the law is in taking initiative, but it may, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, and probably will prevent the Secretary of State knowing about these judgments resulting against drivers whose license should be suspended. I would urge a no vote on HB-322."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I would like to make an additional comment, in addition to what the last speaker pointed out. That is, that one of the reasons why the judgment is to be sent to the Secretary of State is to point out that the fault requirement, in order to have suspension of the driving privileges for not having insurance. Now if the Secretary of State doesn't find out about this then the person who is uninsured and is in an accident, will in all probability continue to have driving privileges. I don't know why we should leave it up to the plaintiff, who may or may not know his rights in this matter, to determine whether or not an uninsured motorist ought to be permitted to continue to operate a motor vehicle on the streets of the State of Illinois, while uninsured, and not bringing into play the other requirements which include proof of insurability, in order to regain driving privileges. So just because one of the clerks is not..was following what the law currently states doesn't mean that we should necessarily amend the law; that the law is bad. So I would join with the Gentleman from Arlington Heights and recommend a 'no' vote on House Bill 322."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we heard a lot of testimony on this particular



Bill in Motor Vehicles. The testimony convinced us the Bill should be passed. It came out of Motor Vehicles unanimously 'do pass'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan to close.....Ah... Beatty to close."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is merely a refinement. It's really taking no....It is in a sense taking a burden off of the Clerk, but what it really does is it allows the plaintiff's attorneys to bring into focus that there is a need to notify the Secretary of State. Otherwise the judgment may have been satisfied, there may have been a number of other reasons why the Secretary of State doesn't have to be notified. There may not be any issue, but the plaintiff may not know, but if the plaintiff is getting a judgment the plaintiff has an attorney. The plaintiff's attorney knows whether or not he wants to proceed further and have a license suspended or not. So instead of burdening the Secretary of State each time there is a judgment, why not allow it to the plaintiff's attorney, otherwise the Secretary of State just gets loaded down with useless paraphernalia, letters from clerks, in this instance you're really assisting the plaintiff to collect his damages by letting his attorney go in and say to the Clerk, 'This is one case where we want the notice to go'. Why have all the notices go? There can be all kinds of action after a judgment. But this pinpoints it and keeps the Secretary of State from being inundated with many notices. I ask for a favor.....Yes, and the plaintiff also knows that the judgment may have been satisfied and in that case you wouldn't want the Clerk to notify the Secretary of State. I 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 wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 100 'aye' and 47 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Three three three Representative Davis, are you seeking recognition?"

Davis: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a point of personal privilege, I'd like to present to this General Assembly the children from the Dumas School, named after the French novelist, Alexandre Dumas. They are to my right in the gallery here. Will the Dumas School students please stand? There they are. Their teachers are Mrs. Arlene Alexander, the daughter of our distinguished colleague here, Mrs. Barbara Caldwell, Lou Caldwell's daughter. Mrs. Jacqueline Cook, Wilma Smith is the community Rep. To my right are these young students. Great Americans. May God Bless you and keep you. Some day I hope you come and take our seats down here."

Speaker Redmond: "Three three three. Representative Leinenweber. Would you read the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 333, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 333 is a relatively simple Bill. It eliminates...briefly, it eliminates state payment for abortions under the Medical Assistance Program of the Department of Public Aid unless the physician certifies that the abortion is necessary to protect the life of the mother. House Bill 333 does not raise the question of whether a woman has a right to have an abortion. The issue is, 'as a matter of public policy of the State of Illinois...to pay for abortions that are not medically necessary'. Conceding that at the moment there are at least five Supreme Court Justices who have stated that the woman's right to



privacy is broad enough to include the decision whether to abort. It does not follow that the taxpayers must pay to enable her to fulfill this right. We have many rights guaranteed under the Constitution, including the Fourth Amendment....Many of these rights are not funded. For example; we have a right to interstate travel but we don't get free bus tickets. We have a right to a free press, but we don't have free printing payments. We have a right to assemble but no one pays for the right to rent a hall. We have a right to read what we want in the privacy of our homes but the state does not pay for pornography. We have a right to cosmetic surgery but the state does not pay for hair transplants. The state, through its exercise of public policy, decides what right it should fund. For example; we have a right to elementary and secondary education and the State of Illinois fulfills that right by funding, one hundred percent through state and local government, our right to elementary and secondary education. House Bill 333 seeks to set public policy by drawing a line on payments for nonmedically necessary surgery. To my knowledge the only nonmedically necessary surgery now paid by the state is abortions. They do not pay for hair transplants, they do not pay for facial uplifts. It is urged by some that denial of state public aid for nonmedically necessary abortions is a denial of the Constitutional rights of a poor woman. First, her Constitutional right is not to an abortion but to the right of privacy. It is none of the state's business whether she and her doctor decide to have an abortion. It does not follow that the state must pay for what is none of its business. It is urged by others that it is a denial of due process to pay for some medical costs but not others. The state currently makes no pretense of paying for any and all medical procedures. The question is, if there is



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

one at all, is there rational distinction between....
 ...medically necessary and medically unnecessary surgery?
 To state the question is to answer it. In conclusion,
 House Bill 333 seeks to set public policy that the state
 ought not to pay for nontherapeutic medically unnecessary
 abortions. There are millions of Illinois taxpayers who
 believe deeply that nontherapeutic abortions are morally
 objectionable. These feelings are to be recognized in
 the public policy of this state. I urge your support
 for House Bill 333."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and
 Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this piece of
 legislation and make a few comments in support of my
 Cosponsor's remarks, Mr. Leinenweber. Mr. Speaker and
 Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, nowhere....nowhere
 in the Supreme Court's 1973 abortion decision did that
 majority report assert that the right to be free from
 legal restraints in deciding on and obtaining an
 abortion, carried with it a duty on the part of the state
 to pay for the abortion when a pregnant woman could not
 afford one. The expressed will of Congress, Ladies and
 Gentlemen, contained ... in the so-called Hyde Amendment,
 to the HEW Labor Appropriations Act of October 1976, is
 that the Federal Government is not...is not to pay
 for abortions....with tax moneys. Their will has been
 disregarded by Federal Judge John Duley's decision to
 stay enforcement of the ban which decision was allowed
 to stand at least temporarily by the U. S. Supreme
 Court. The Federal Constitution gives to Congress alone
 the power to appropriate money from the U. S. Treasury
 It seems clear that the Supreme Court must ultimately
 bow to the will of congress on this matter and I hope
 that they do that very shortly. If the state and or...
 the Federal Governments pay for the exercise of ..



Constitutional Rights, as Representative Leinenweber indicated, all the other rights that we have, are we expected to fund those rights also? It is worth.... adding note....that the right to abortion was only recently discovered by the Supreme Court. It is certainly not one of the framers of our Constitution. They certainly did not see fit to include it. Also, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, pregnancy is not an illness. An abortion is not just another medical procedure. It is an elective surgery undertaken to relieve stresses which are nearly always social, economic or psychological. Seldom physical to the point of threatening a pregnant woman's life. We have heard that it has been charged with House Bill 333 and its Federal counterpart are discriminatory towards the poor. If the state is required to make excessable to the poor all those commodities that the wealthy can afford on their own then the Treasurer had better girt up for the onslaught. In 1973, pardon me, in 1975...HEW paid something like fifty million dollars for welfare abortions. We tried to get the figures on what it was costing the State of Illinois and we could not come up with an accurate figure but we know it runs into millions of dollars. This kind of money, Ladies and Gentlemen, could go a long way toward alleviating the conditions that sometimes make abortions seem like the only way out of a difficult situation. In particular the difficulty that a pregnant unmarried woman has in obtaining relief until she has delivered her baby is not only deplorable but it is often the deciding factor for a woman who is on the fence between abortion and carrying a baby to full term. The question Ladies and Gentlemen, is not on the abortion issue, but the question on House Bill 333 is whether the state was going to pay for those abortions and I urge the support of House Bill 333."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."



Hudson: "Thank you....thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This particular kind of Bill and the subject is of course inclined to be or apt to be an emotional one and it would therefore seem to me to be in the interest of all to address myself to the rational and reasonable basis behind House Bill 333, which I strongly support. The Bill seeks to cover the cost of only medically necessary procedures and not elective procedures. And ...it would seem to me that to deny that the state may make distinctions between medically indicated abortions and non-medically indicated abortions in its social and economic programs, would be to deny to the legislative authorities and to all of us as Representatives, the right to make rational classification based on valid public interest. The issue seems to be also, whether the equal protection clause of the Federal Constitution has thrust upon Illinois an affirmative burden to pay for elective non-medically indicated abortions....if the state pays for any other cost arising from medical necessities and pregnancy. It would be foolish, I believe, to apply this strict scrutiny test of equal protection to the abortion funding question, and thus declare that because one has a fundamental right to abortion, which the courts have said women do, that the state must perforce and therefore finance it. This is so because there is no constitutional mandate that the state must finance the exercise of fundamental rights. Representative Leinenweber has already called your attention to other rights that are recognized as fundamental, but which at the same time the state is under no obligation to finance or to pay for it. I think this is essential to our understanding of this issue. I would conclude by simply suggesting to you, my colleagues, that this is an entirely rational, constitutional, legal approach to a very difficult question and that the enactment of House Bill 333 seems to fall within the



discretion granted the State of Illinois under Title IX, and in no way conflicts with a woman's abortion right under the United States Constitution. I commend Representative Leinenweber for the Bill, and other Sponsors, and recommend strongly that you think about it and you cast a green vote for this essential protective Bill. It's in the best interest of all of our taxpayers and all of our citizens. I urge you to vote 'yes' on 333."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Chapman: "Mr. Leinenweber, could you tell me....under your Bill, if it became law, what would happen if someone on public aid were raped or if there was incest occurring? Would your Bill provide for abortion under those circumstances?"

Leinenweber: "No."

Chapman: "I think you said 'no'....Mr. Leinenweber?"

Leinenweber: "Correct. I said 'no'."

Chapman: "Okay. Thank you. I have a further question. Has Bills such as yours, when they have been approved by other states, been upheld to your knowledge....by any of the courts? "

Leinenweber: "To my knowledge, there is only one.....there is no definitive decision on this particular question. Thethere is currently a district court injunction restraining the Department of Health, Education and Welfare from operating under the Hyde Amendment. That is the closest thing to a court decision. The district court decision of course only applies in that particular district."

Chapman: "Mr. Leinenweber, my understanding was that there were three different instances where suits were brought and all three of these federal district courts issued restraining orders in regard to the so-called Hyde



Amendment. Is that true to you knowledge?"

Leinenweber: "To my knowledge, the district court of New York has issued a restraining order, which means that in the opinion of a particular district court judge who was appointed...appointed judge....that in his opinion there was a question as to the constitutionality of the Hyde Amendment.As far short of a definitivepoint which you are leading up to is whether or not the Bill is Constitutional."

Chapman: "May I speak to the Bill now, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "You may."

Chapman: "Denial of funding for abortions under the Medical Assistance Program clearly discriminates against public aid recipients. Equal protection arguments have thus far been upheld in states that have attempted restrictions similar to those embodied in this Bill. Rape is a very real concern. It not only is a problem as far as information that we have but it is an under-reported crime. To deny to public aid recipients help under the law in these circumstances to me is absolutely unacceptable. Clearly, when this matter is before the courts now, it makes sense to defer any decision until the court has spoken and I do ask the Members of this House to vote 'no' on House Bill 333."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye'; 'aye'; opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. Representative Leinenweber to close.you all....to explain your vote."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in response to the last speakers point about whether we should defer until there is a definitive court ruling. There's absolutely no reason in the world, when there is not a definitive court



that we should not do something that is just and right. Since the state medical programs are presumably instituted to protect the lives and health of the poor, how does payment for elective medically unnecessary surgery serve the state's interest? Even setting aside the central moral question of feticide in every abortion, should the state be forced to pay for operations simply because some patients happen to want them? Millions of taxpayers happen to believe that there are better uses for our tax dollars than killing unborn children. I urge your support of House Bill 333."

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

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in explanation of my vote, and I will try to be brief because my light was on from the very beginning of the debate and I wasn't allowed a chance to speak to the Bill.It seems to me that there are some contradictions here. On the one hand...one of the proponents of this Bill...and I see it is going to pass...On the one hand he says that there was fifty million dollars spent for this purpose in the last fiscal year. But on the other handand I underline this....on the other hand, in this state, the only area in public aid that had a reduction in it, in this fiscal year, was Aid to Dependent Children. That was the only area that went down. One of the causes of that reduction is before us today, the prohibition that you are putting on medical service for poor. It seems to me that on the one hand if you say that the poor cannot receive medical services in this area, then on the other hand not appropriate sufficient amount of money for those families to live on, it seems to me that you are doing only one thing here, you're saying to them that they cannot receive servicesmedical services....that are provided for the population as a whole, but yet and still



you will not provide for them ...the necessary funds for them to survive. It seems to me that if we're going to do something in that fashion, that there is only one alternative....is to fund these programs. To insure that the programs are sufficient for the people to survive on them or either allows them....allows them, in concert with all laws, with all federal courts, to be able to receive the same medical services that are available for all citizens in all walks of life....in our state and in our country. This state and this legislation has not been upheld by any court....by any court....in this state or by the Federal Government and I'm more than sure that it will not be upheld even though it will sell out of here with those 111 votes. When the public aid supplemental and the public aid appropriation come over, I'm going to remind each and every one of those 111 votes to insure that there are sufficient money to fund those public aid programs. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines to explain his vote."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wish to join my able colleague on the other side of the aisle who admonished these so-called frugal, thrifty minded Legislatorsthat when you get down to the whole bottom of the deal you are talking about spending three hundred dollars to our mother who says that I can't handle this child, an opportunity not to have a child that you'll have to support for twenty years on public aid, another twenty years in prison, and then the rest of its life on old age. The one thing that most cripples have in common be they millionaires or paupers, is that they feel that they are not wanted. I was a public aid worker for nine years and if a mother came and said, 'I can't handle this child.' She really means it. Do you, on one hand, force her to have the child and on the other, ask her to take care of it which she is not going to do? Then you are not



going to appropriate sufficient funds to take care of that child in a foster home. You're not going to appropriate sufficient funds to take care of that child in a mental institution. You're not going to appropriate sufficient funds to take care of that mother in a penal institution. You're not going to appropriate enough funds to do anything to support that child after it gets here. Yet you say you want to economize. I know you want to use the least of these as a whipping boys and girls. As the Good Lord says, 'As you do the least of these you do unto Me.' So I'm saying that all of you righteous folks when the time comes to pay the piper, remember you called the tune. So I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, there has been a variety of reasons given here for supporting or opposing this particular Bill. But I think when you strip away all of the reasons, in my opinion and in my mind in voting it, this is absolutely a right to life vote. I believe so strongly in the right of every person, including the unborn, to be free from the unnatural termination of its life that, notwithstanding the fact that the Supreme Court, in my opinion wrongfully and morally has taken away the right of the unborn to continue to live. This is an important step and at least one step that we can take and Constitutionally take to try to restore the right to life of every person. I think that for this Legislature to continue to appropriate money or allow money to the Department of Public Aid or elsewhere, to be used for abortions, is the same, in my opinion and I emphasize absolutely the same, as if we had a line item appropriation this year for a professional killer or a hit man to go out and eliminate people who are undesirable. I think it's that clear an issue and I think is a right to life issue and in that



framework every Member of this General Assembly ought to rise in strong support of House Bill 333."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am voting 'present' today on this Bill. Two years ago in Committee, I voted against it because I was convinced it was discriminatory and therefore unconstitutional. I am voting 'present' today. I'll explain this to my constituents because this now is before the Federal Court and the Hyde Amendment will be decided by the Federal Court. If the Court upholds it and finds it constitutional so be it, we can then pass the Bill. I don't know how the court is going to rule. I suspect it will find it unconstitutional. I hope they don't. I'm against abortion, but I see no point in what I call a 'knee-jerk' reaction to the demands of our voters to be constantly throwing Bills in the courts. This is exactly what we're going to be doing with this one. It's very emotional, it so easy to vote 'yes' and please your constituents because I am a pro-life person. I think it is dishonest. I live under a constitution and I think we ought to wait for the Federal Courts to make the decision, which they will be doing shortly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Corneal Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm happy to follow the distinguished Lady that....who spoke before me. I will not twist my logic to support my prejudice. Who interprets the law? We make the law but we do not interpret it. They might take into consideration the intent of the Legislature, but not the interpretation and you know that. You're simply whistling sand across the desert, and polking a finger of scorn at poor women who can't afford to pay for an abortion. Let the courts of this land continue to interpret the laws and let us continue to make laws. Always with a clear view in



mind that this is one nation under Godwith liberty and justice for all. This means poor, rich, white, black, blue or blind. That's why I'm voting 'no'. It's discriminatory and you know it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to interupt here for a minute, if I may, to introduce the young man that's here to kickoff the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation drive for the Springfield region and he is with us here this afternoon. Mr. Jeff Vorderstrasse, from the Springfield area. Jeff is here with us today."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly. Representative Kelly. Representative Pullen..."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is no doubt in my mind as to who is in charge of the spending of the State of Illionois and that is this Body and the Body across the hall. If we cannot control whether Medicaid funds shall be paid for abortions, who can? Certainly this is in our authority and we must act today to stop the use of public money for murder. I shudder to think about the public aid caseworkers whom we pressure all of the time to cut the caseload, counseling pregnant public aid mothers who are in an emotional moment and counseling them very possibly to have an abortion so that they don't increase the caseload. This is a horrible thought to my mind but I can see how it could very well happen. We must stop this murder. This genocide....if you will. I urge you to vote 'aye' on this very good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to interupt to introduce a school we have from the 47th District. Represented by Representatives McGrew,McMaster and myself. This is the Roseville School, sitting over in the ...east



balcony....and they are with Paul Stephenson, the Principal of the school."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 119 'aye' and 41 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with by leave of the Minority Leader, I would like to introduce the students and teachers of the Central Junior High of Zion, Illinois. One hundred strong. This district....the 31st District, represented by Representative Don Matijevich, Representatives Griesheimer and myself. They are up there in the balcony and we're glad to have them here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis, you have another request, didn't you?"

Geo-Karis: "Yes. I had to step out....because my constituents had called me out and I missed voting on three Bills. I would like to have leave of the House to vote 'aye' on House Bill 302, 318 and 322. I was here for 314."

Speaker Redmond: "Does she have leave? Hearing no objections. Leave is granted."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've had many many occasions to rise and introduce outstanding citizens of our country and outstanding future citizens of our country. Today it is my privilege to introduce two people who have just recently become citizens of the United States, as recent as one o'clock. They were sworn in as citizens of this great land of ours. My privilege today to introduce two people who are native from Beirut, Lebanon. And who are presently members of the St. Gregory the Illuminator Armenian Apostolic Church in Granite City, Illinois, who were just sworn in as



citizens of the United States, today. I'd like to introduce, back in the rear, in the balcony, Khoren Habeshian and his wife Berjoochi from Granite City, Illinois. Congratulations to you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative John Dunn."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker....Mr. Speaker....may I..."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me. Proceed."

Lucco: "May I have one other introduction. Along with them are the distinguished mother and father of one of our pages, Melanie Asadorian, who are up here with these people, Mr. and Mrs. Asadorian, from Granite City."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative John Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I request leave of the House to change my vote from 'aye' to 'no' on House Bill 302."

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

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder, don't we have a rule that prohibits the introduction of people.....during the Session of this House?"

Speaker Redmond: "Rule 55-I."

Bluthardt: "Well, I would suggest that we enforce that. Especially during Third Reading, when we're struggling so hard to cut down the size of this Calendar. I resent the many...many introductions that are being made and interrupting the orderly process of this House."

Speaker Redmond: "Three three eight."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 338, a Bill for an Act to provide for the legislative review of the rules and regulations promulgated by State agencies, boards and Commissions, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio. Representative Davis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, the remark has been made here that they resent the introduction.....of people. Let me remind you that I am one of those, in this House, who believe that we do not own these Chambers, that these Chambers



are the proprietary and the ownership and the title of it goes to all of the people in the State of Illinois and if our children can't come down here and we interrupt the proceedings in here.....God help us!.....and introduce those children in this chamber....in their governmental chamber...God help us!....Because some of the things that we do in here, I sit here and watch them, are far more harmful to this state and to this Body.....than introducing these young children. May we always introduce them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio.....on 338."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 338 goes a little further than what the three Bills that were just passed earlier today, of Yourell and Edgar. House Bill 338 creates the Illinois Legislative Review of the Rules Act....and says that on a motion by the House and the Senate we could stop a rule regulation from being enforced. It was a little loose when it went to the Executive Committee, there were two Amendments put on it...by Representative Leinenweber. What it does...it tries to put into effect the stoppage of anything, whether it be a rule or regulation prior to its enactment. It sets up four members from each House and to me an example that we witness through the Motor Vehicle Laws Commission with rules and regulations with regard to noise, gave me the idea to come up with this Bill. I think it had a fair hearing. I think it was heard quite a bit on the Second Reading and if there is any question I'd be more than happy to answer it if I can. If not, I'd ask for your favorable support."

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

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill that is proposed by the Representative from the suburban area of Chicago is a very good one. Many times our voters say to



us, 'You're the Legislature, you're making the laws, why is it you're letting these agencies do these things? Well this Bill, if enacted, will give us some control over what these rules are that are promulgated by these agencies, which are hurting our people. We're the Legislature, we should make the laws. This is a very fine Bill. It'll make us more effective as a Legislature and I think there is no question we should pass this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt. Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, as a matter of personal privilege, and I don't like to interrupt the debate. But I want to call to the attention of the Gentleman who responded to my complaint. The Rule that's known as 55.....wait until I put my glasses on....'I'.....If I may, I'll read it? 'Only the Speaker, Majority Leader and Minority Leader may introduce or recognize guests of the House area or in the balcony. No such introductions or recognitions shall occur while ... any other matter is before the House.' I would ask that you enforce that Rule, hereafter, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "I ask leave?Refer to me. That may be the Rule, but I'm sure whoever those Members were that introduced guests in the gallery....certainly got permission from the Speaker. I would be willing to,.....Well, I am a preacher, I can't say wager. I'd be willing to say they did get it. Did they not get permission from you? Did they? If they did, then they are perfectly legal, if they got permission from the Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could take a moment of your time? There is a Gentleman in the balcony.....with a brown and green tie...I've always liked those ties. Would the Gentleman stand up and be recognized for wearing a brown and green tie?"



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones, J. D.: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to be recorded 'aye' on 333. I stepped out in the hallway and the Bill passed."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Three three eight....Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "I was also out.....on House Bill 212 and I wonder if I could be recorded as 'no' on 212?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Hearing none..."

Greiman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: ".....leave is granted. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to have leave to be recorded on 333 as voting 'aye'."

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

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on theRepresentative Giglio's Bills....The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 'aye' and 12 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Three four one. Representative Taylor."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 341, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Fair Employment Practices Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 341 amends the Fair Employment Practices Act. It makes it an unfair employment practice to require a job applicant to disclose a conviction of a crime if the end of the sentence imposed was such a time as more than seven years prior to the job application. This Bill has been in this



House on two different occasions and passed out both times. Last time it went to the Governor's Desk and it was vetoed. And this year in Committee members of the Committee felt that Amendments should be made in order to justify the means that the Governor had vetoed the Bill on and therefore I have weakened the Bill to some extent and have put an Amendment on there which means that the employment can ask certain questions about certain crimes. I therefore move that House Bill.....I solicit your support for House Bill 341.

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall this Bill...Representative Schlickman..."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "By Amendment #1, you exempt state or national banks. Is that correct?"

Taylor: "Amendment #1?.....Yes."

Schlickman: "Why haven't you exempted....Savings and Loan Associations?"

Taylor: "Well, Iexempt the thing that the bank came and asked me to exempt....and that's what I did."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further...."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill would amend the Fair Employment Practices Act so as to prevent an employer....prospective employer...to inquire of a prospective employee as to whether or not at any time in that individual's life, he or she, has been convicted of a crime. This Bill says that if the crime had been committed seven years prior to the application, the individual need not reveal that fact. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I oppose the Bill in general principle. This is another incident, another example of our telling the employers of this state how to operate their businesses.



Number two; the selection of seven years is arbitrary, makes no distinction between the kinds of crime that an individual previously may have been convicted for and then Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it provides for an exemption to a state or national bank without taking into account the sensitivity or the sensitive nature of other financial institutions and other kinds of employers. I think in principle, the Bill is bad and I think it is discriminatory with respect to the exemptions that are provided in it and therefore I respectfully suggest, with all due deference to the Sponsor of this Bill, a Gentleman, that this Bill be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Taylor to close."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Gentleman speak...on the other side of the aisle. He did not read Amendment #2....which has corrected some of the injustices that they felt were in the Bill. However, I feel that it is a good Bill, that it will solve some of the problems of the people in my district who are unemployed and they cannot get a job simply because of the fact that they have had a conviction and they have no other recourse but to go back to crime. I suggest that it is a good Bill. It will help us with the Department of Public Aid where we are paying those individuals who stay at home. We ought to give them and make preparations so that they can work and that's what my Bill calls for and I solicit your support."

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

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, I guess the only question we have to ask ourselves is, when do we wipe the slate clean? You know, at what part in ones life do we say, he has paid



his penalty and he wants to rejoin society.. You might even call this a christian redemption Bill....whatever... whatever your morality might suggest. You know ...at some point I suggest someone should have the opportunity to live as if he has paid his debt to society and legally he has paid his debt once he has served his sentence. I've asked myself that question and I think seven years after the end of service of the sentence is time enough."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 102 'aye' and 47 'no'.... The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Three four three. Representative Mann."

Mann: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave to be cast as voting 'no' on House Bill 333? I was not on the floor at the time. It does not change the results."

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

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 343, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Public Aid Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 343 simply provides that the Department of Public Aid shall at least consider nonpayment of rent for two consecutive months as evidence of grant mismanagement by a parent or relative of a recipient who is responsible for making rental payment for the housing or shelter of the child or family.....Unless the Department determines that such nonpayment is necessary for the protection of the health or welfare of the recipient. I solicit your 'aye' vote on this Bill."

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

BRADLEY IN THE CHAIR..



BRADLEY IN CHAIR.....

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Stearney? Somebody vote Mr. Stearney 'aye' please? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 126 'ayes', 10 'nays'....11 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Clerk Hall: "Representative Bradley in the Chair."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bill 345.."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 345, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections relating to the wage deductions for the benefit of creditors and regulating the issuance of deduction orders, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

McLendon: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill was put in at the request of the Illinois State Bar and the Chicago Bar Association. It came out of the Judiciary Committee 19 to nothing. It is in fact a merely Bill. It merely puts the state law, with respect to wage assignments in conformity with the federal law of wage assignments. I ask the approval of the House."

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 wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 142 'ayes', 2 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 358. "

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 358, a Bill for an Act in relation to the recovery of waste oil, amending an Act named therein, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Pierce: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what this Bill would



do would be to encourage the collection, reuse and re-refining of lubricating oil. Only five percent of our petroleum produced in this country is capable of being used for lubricating oil. The lubricating oil you use in your automobile and drain out of the engine can be cleansed up, rerefined and used again for the same purpose. Now many major trucking lines and railroads and so on do collect the oil and do rerefine it and do use it again. The purpose of this Bill is to encourage.....is to encourage all of us to collect the lubricating oil we drain out when we change oil, to get it back to the rerefiningso it can be used again. Now what happens when we pour it down the drain, as some people do who change their own oil, of course it goes into a storm sewer, it doesn't disappear, it ends up in a creek or a river or a lake. All the lubricating oil drained out of automobile crankcases and poured down the drain in your driveway, your garage or the street, or in a gas station, goes into a stream, river or creek, through the storm sewer system. So this Bill has two purposes. One to keep that oil out of the storm sewers and the creeks, rivers and streams. Secondly, to conserve energy, our rare petroleum products by reusing...rerefining and re-using lubricating oil. It's practical, it can be done. Companies right here in Illinois that do it and therefore I ask for passage of House Bill 358, the Waste Oil Rerefining Act."

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

Polk: "Will the Sponsor yield for one question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Polk: "Dan, what happens to the individual who takes care of the maintenance on his own automobile.....that may have two or three cars and they drain their own oil. What is their responsibility in...in...containing this material?"

Pierce: "They have no real responsibility or penalty. All



that we provide is thatthe retailer that sells the oil have a place for him to return the oil....and then that that retailer.....just like most gas stations today, have collections facilities where the oil can be picked up and reused. Actually the Bill doesn't provide any penalty or bureaucratic administration on the user, but we feel that people, as they become more energy conservation conscious, when they go back to that K-Mart or Woolco or wherever they bought that oil, that they would return the old oil rather than pour it down the drain. There will be a collection facility for them there, when they go to buy the new oil. So to that extent it is not at all forced on them....We do require voluntary cooperation by having a place for him to return the oil for reuse, which he doesn't have now....in most instances.

Polk: "So then, under the law, would it be my responsibility if I drained my own crankcase, that I must contain that material and take it back to quote 'K-Mart' as you said? If I do not then I am in violation of the state law?"

Pierce: "You completely misheard me or didn't listen to me."

Polk: "I was listening. I don't think you made it quite clear."

Pierce: "I said there is no requirement on you that you do that. We will provide a place for you to do it, if you want to do it. Right now the place where you bought the oil, whether it be Sears, Woolco, K-Mart....wherever it might be, doesn't have a place for you to return the oil. So you pour it down the drain. What else are you going to do with it? This Bill doesn't force you to do it. Doesn't fine you if you don't do it. Doesn't mandate that you do it. But it provides that that retail out or wholesale outlet, where you bought that oil, that they have a place for you to return the oil for reuse and rerefining. Most gas stations now.....of any responsibility....do collect and keep the oil they drain out of crankcases and do have it picked up for reuse. So....to answer your question,



no, you're not violating the law if you don't do it, if you want to pour it down your drain. But we are encouraging you to do it by requiring that the person that sells the lubricating oil have collection facilities for you to return it to when you go to buy new oil, if you are so inclined. This is strictly a voluntary Bill on the ultimate consumer, but it is mandatory on the retailer or wholesaler."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Bartulis."

Bartulis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Bill, for the simple reason that we cannot regulate everybody. Now we're regulating the people who come to local discount stores or service stations....to buy..... want to change their own oil. And we have to supply them with a place to return it. How many are going to return it? I think we're just putting on a little too much regulation on this Body andspend more time on good legislation. Therefore, ...I hope this Bill is defeated."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Madison: "Representative Pierce, I'm not sure that I understand the effect of Amendment #1. Maybe you could explain that to me....briefly?"

Pierce: "We make sure, in Amendment #1, that the rerefined oil is equivalent to the quality of the new oil you would buy for your car....up to Federal Trade Commission standards or ...and that it be indicated that it is rerefined oil. In other words we want to make sure, when the oil is rerefined, that it is as good for your car as the original oil. This can be done. In fact, all the trucking companies, most of the major ones, buy rerefined oil...rerefine their oil, as do the railroads. So it's just to make sure that no one is going to peddle old oil as new oil. That's the purpose of the Amendment, that the rerefined oil be



of the same quality for your automobile, as the virgin oil that you might buy."

Madison: "Thank you very much."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Leverenz: "Will the consumer be ...in any way...reimbursed for hauling this oil back to the place where he is supposed to take it? Would he get a rebate or...dollar incentive? Or a deposit on the can or ...for which he would bring the old oil back and get a nickel back or something? If you take four quarts out of quart cans and you have a tub ofa gallon, how do you get it back in the cans and back there?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Pierce?"

Pierce: "I figured that was a question. I couldn't see who was talking. It sounded like...."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Leverenz, in the rear of the chamber.."

Pierce: "...someone was trying to be funny, but I didn't think it was too funny. The question was, who pays for taking it back? The retailer only collects it...and it is taken...it would then be taken back by the distributor who distributes the oil and returned to a waste oil re-refining facility. You know there are costs to the environment, if you are putting something out in the environment that can get into creeks, streams and rivers and pollute them, then you have a responsibility to at least try to provide a facility for returning that. There is a market for this oil. This oil is being purchased by re-refining facilities. This oil can be either burned again for heat or it can be rerefined and used as lubricating oil. There is a market for it. No one is losing any money on it. All we try to do is encourage them to do it. Now who is going to pour it from one can into another can, I didn't understand....I'm sure there is a clever point



there but I didn't quite get it."

Leverenz: "Certainly. The first question was, if it is so ... good to have it returned, and there is a use for it shouldn't the consumer receive some remuneration for bringing it back? I wondered if that was in the Bill also?"

Pierce: "No, the Bill doesn't provide a remuneration.....for the consumer, but the consumer has no cost because he doesn't have to ...he doesn't have to provide the collection facility. The retailer does. So the retailer would get the benefit, when the oil is returned....at what market price he could get. At the same time he would have to provide storage and sometimes it is underground storage, that would be required by a local ordinance, for the oil. Maybe you're right. Maybe if we had an economic motivation on the consumer.....But we're not stopping the consumer from selling the oil, by the way. If the consumer can find somewhere he can sell it for money, he can do that.....under this Bill. We don't provide for mandatory deposit, if that's what your question was?"

Leverenz: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Davis: "Thank you. Representative Pierce, your threshold is five hundred quarts of oil for a recycling facility. That would seem to indicate that virtually every service station in the State of Illinois, who does any reasonable volume of business at all...would be involved in this. Can you give us some idea, or have you addressed yourself to the question of how much capital expenditure would be involved for each collection station? Or conversely, each service station in the State of Illinois."

Pierce: "I haven't. The service stations, most of them



provide it. I understand Representative Bartulis's service station already has these facilities.....under ground. They are required to ...by local ordinances. Now, I understand....remember the people that run the gas stations didn't oppose this Bill. I understand they already have the collection facilities. The retail stores don't all have it.....your Woolco, your K-Mart... who are competing with the gas stationsyour Sears Roebuck....and Montgomery Wards and so on. I understand Mr. Davis.....and I don't have the facts you want...the figures, but I understand the gas stations, especially the ones of this size, have those facilities already, because they are draining crankcases every day, in their stations, and the gas stations aren't dumping that down the drain. They couldn't stay in business if they did that. But the person that buys it at the discount store or theor the retail store is doing that. And even the Gentleman here that spoke against it, Representative Bartulis, I understand he collects all his lubricating oil that he uses in his gas station, and he returns it to Pierce Oil, no relative, here in Springfield....and they do something with it."

Davis, J.: "Well, I thank you. I think you've explained part of the problem but I think I can presume accurately, though that there a great number of service stations within the state who do not have this facility available to them and so I just make that point. Number two, Representative Pierce...."

Pierce: "What are they doing, dumping it on the ground or down the drain?"

Davis, J.: "I frankly do not know what they are doing with it, at this point. Local ordinances might prevail and maybe someone wiser than I could answer that for both of us. I would ask another question. I was unaware of the secondary market in used oil and if it does exist, is it satisfactory



enough so that the collector or the cycler doesn't violate the law by simply dumping...into the sanitary or the storm sewer system?"

Pierce: "I understand, Representative Davis, that it is, that there is a large market for the recycled lubricating oil. It can be used in any automobile engine. It can be used in any truck, diesel engine or any train. In fact, the railroads in Chicago do collect their lubricating oil and have it recycled. Some of your larger truck lines do.... on their own. And the gas stations are able to find a market for the oil. And...by the way, if there isn't enough market for it, as lubricating oil, it can certainly be burned as heating oil, mixed with other oils and burned for heating and power purposes as a number five oil or a number six oil or whatever."

Davis, J.: "Thank you. You've answered my question."

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

Brandt: "Move the previous question, Mr. Chairman."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question.

All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce to close."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill won't cure all of our problems but it does one thing, it takes a variable petro.....petroleum product, lubricating oil, which only five percent of our petroleum is fit to be used and turned into lubricating oil, and it attempts to have that lubricating oil collected, returned and rerefined again as lubricating oil...and if there's not enough business for lubricating oil it can be burned for heater power as many refineries do now. Secondly, it cleans up the environment because gas stations aren't doing this, they are not pouring the oil they drain down the drain but many ...many home owners, because they have



nothing else to do with it, when they change their oil, are pouring it down their drain in the driveway and out on the parkway or even in their garage... When that goes into the storm sewers, like every storm sewer, it's finding its way into a body of water. And in that body of water, the oil is helping to pollute the stream, river creek or lake or whatever it might be. So this Bill is a small step at getting away from the throw away society and rerefining. The gas station people aren't against it. Some retailers don't want to have to collect it. But the gas station people, believe me, have not written against it. Some just as soon not have the Bill but they haven'tdidn't testify against it and haven't really opposed it and I ask that you support House Bill 358."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall House Bill 358 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff to explain his vote."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we have some legislation here that is unnecessary. I think this is being done now and what we are doing here we are putting more regulations on the people and the small businesses. I just don't believe it is needed because I think the oil is being taken care of at the present and I would hope that we would defeat this legislation."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The....Clerk will Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 96 'aye', 40 'nay', 14 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 364..... The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Bartulis."

Bartulis: "Yes, I'd like to have a verification of that vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman requests a verification. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."



Pierce: "Poll the absentees, please."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that ...that request is untimely. You've always given the person.... the opportunity...You looked around, you waited for a while and then you declared it passed. I think we're on the next order of business. You did call the next Bill, I recall. The Clerk is nodding in the affirmative that he did call the next Bill. I think that"

Pierce: "I don't think that our Chair had called the next Bill yet. I had....."

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

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, we're getting along very well in the chamber. Things are moving along. The Gentleman has asked for a verification. He is entitled to it. I don't think anyone would deny that. I'm voting for the Bill. He is still entitled to a verification."

Speaker Bradley: "In the opinion of the Chair I think the Gentleman is entitled to a verification with the exception of.....at this point...that...generally, when we're going to ask for a verification it is done sometime before the Roll Call is announced, and I did announce the passage of the Bill. Now what do we do if we come back and we don't have the vote. And it's already announced that it has been passed. It seems to me that we are putting the Chair in a position that is untenable. Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, in the first instance, I think the Representative indicated that he had his light on.... But that was kind of a stretched out Roll Call, 'Ger'."

Houlihan, J.: ".....Which gave him plenty of time to ask for a verification, also."

Telcser: "He asked for it. Let him have it. He is entitled to it."

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

Flinn: ".....I was not on the floor at the time this Roll Call



was taken. I think I show as absent. Vote me 'aye', please."

Speaker Bradley: "I think it might be simpler to give the Gentleman his verification ...and that's with the approval and the generosity of the Sponsor of the Bill. So, firstpoll the absentees.....Call the absentees."

Clerk Hall: "Beatty, Barnes...Beatty, Bennett, Brandt, Deavers, Dyer, Friedland, Hoffman, Jacobs....."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Jacobs wishes to be recorded 'aye'. Anybody else? Kornowicz...Mr. Brummet wishes to be recorded 'aye'. Mr. O'Brien, how is he recorded? We better check and see. Mr. O'Brien is recorded as not voting. Wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Beatty wishes to be recorded 'aye'. Mc...er...O...O'Daniel wishes to be recorded 'aye'. Mr. Katz, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Katz: "I wanted to be verified. I have to leave the floor.. and I am an affirmative vote..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Bartulis, can you verify Mr. Katz?..... Martin wishes to be recorded as 'no'.....Record Martin as voting 'no'.....The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan.:

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will you change my vote to 'no', please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Ryan wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. He was voting 'aye'. Jane Barnes, for what purpose ...do you..."

Barnes, Jane: "I would like to be recorded voting 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "How are you recorded?....."

Clerk Hall: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "You wish to change your vote to 'no'. Mr. Stearney.

Stearney: "Would you change my vote to 'no'?"

Speaker Bradley: "How are you recorded, Mr. Stearney?"

Stearney: "Yes."

Speaker Bradley: "Change his vote to 'no'. Mr. Peters...not recorded as voting..."

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



Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "Not voting."

Peters: "Please vote me 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Mr. Keats?"

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded."

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "Present".

Keats: "Please change my vote to 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Mr. Winchester."

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

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Winchester: "Please record me as voting 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record him as voting 'no'. Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "How am I recorded?"

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

Anderson: "Please change me to 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Mr. Friedland was not recorded and he wishes to be recorded as voting 'present'. Mr. Telcser wishes to be recorded as voting 'present'. Mr. Kempiners?"

Kempiners: "Could you change me from 'yes' to 'present', please?"

Speaker Bradley: (several seconds silence.) "Mr. Kempiners, did we get you on....You are recorded as voting 'aye'. Did you want to change your vote?"

Kempiners: "To present."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay. Mr. Edgar? You are recorded as voting 'aye'."

Edgar: "Vote me 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Edgar wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. McCourt?.....Mccourt."

Mccourt: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Bradley: "You are recorded as not voting?"

Mccourt: "Please vote me 'no'."



Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brandt. How is Mr. Brandt recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Brandt: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Mr. Barnes. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as not voting. All right. Are there any other changes? Right now we have 99 'ayes'. I'm sorry, we have 98....Mr. Totten...Mr. Totten wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. From 'aye' to 'no'; Sir? Mr. Madison?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, now when the request for verification came....it...it...according to the rules, Mr. Speaker, it was untimely. I only raised this point because I don't particularly like what's happening here. Particularly when an appeal came from a Member of the opposite side, to be a good Gentleman, because he was voting for the Bill only to have it reconsidered, and then he changes his vote. The request for verification, Mr. Speaker, according to Rule 47 (c) was very definitely untimely and not in order."

Speaker Bradley: ".....Only with the permission of the Chief Sponsor did we agree to the verification. Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, that provision that you just cited is not in the rules."

Speaker Bradley: "That's true, Sir."

Madison: "It does not require for an acquiescence by the Sponsor. It simply says that verification may not be held if the next order of business has been called and you very definitely called House Bill 364, before the verification was requested. So....it's untimely."

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

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



Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Mr. Madison?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I request the Chair's position on my indication that this verification is untimely, according to Rule 47 (c). If you need to, Mr. Speaker, you can play the tape back and you will see very definitely that you called House Bill 364."

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

Matijevich: "Point of order. If he can find Rule 47 (c), he has got a different rule book than I've got. There is no 'c', Jesse."

Madison: ".....it's 48 (c)..."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to sustain the Chair's ruling, House Bill 364 is my Bill. It was not called. I was sitting here waiting for him to call it and it was not called as the next order of business."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, to repeat my position. I have no objection to the verification. I want an accurate vote. And if the people want to change their vote, they can change their vote. If they want to verify the vote, they can verify the vote. But I'll tell you this, I'm not going to postpone it or take it out of the record. This will be the record, that's all."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. The Clerk will call the....the... Affirmative Roll Call. Mr. Bartulis, do you still persist in your request for a verification? Mr. Bartulis. Will you turn him on?"

Bartulis: "What's the count?"

Speaker Bradley: "Ninety-six 'ayes' and fifty 'nays'."

Bartulis: "That isn't the way I counted....but...Mr. Epton.."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Epton..."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in order to avoid controversy which somehow seems to be



getting completely out of hand, especially in view of Representative Pierce's gratuitous comments. Since I voted on the prevailing side, I will now make a motion to reconsider. So that we can get back on the track."

Speaker Bradley: "First I'd like to find out, Mr. Bartulis, are you persisting or are you withdrawing your request?"

Bartulis: "I'll withdraw my request."

Speaker Bradley: "Thank you, Sir. The results have been declared. Now we have a motion to reconsider the (moments of silence) The Clerk is totaling the final vote....if we can just give him a second?On this question there are 95 'ayes', 50 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Epton has moved, having voted on the prevailing side, by which House Bill 356....358 passed. He now moves to reconsider that vote.....The question is on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor of reconsidering the Gentleman's motion ...The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I move that motion lie on the table."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that Mr. Epton's motion lie on the table. Mr. Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm a little bit embarrassed to make this plea to a colleague but my attempt is not dilatory. My attempt is to get this House back on the proper course. If this motion goes up or down, sobeit. But why do we have to have all this constant maneuvering and bipartisanship 'unado' which certainly doesn't belong in this category. It would seem to me, my distinguished colleagues, that we go ahead with this Bill and vote it up or down. We do resolve the problem."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman's words are well taken and I withdraw my motion."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. Now we return to the Gentleman's



Motion to reconsider the vote by which that Bill passed. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, on the Gentleman's motion."

Matijevich: "I still think that motion to lie on the table is a good move....and I'll make it."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. Now, we're back to lying it on the table. Now we're at Mr. Matijevich's motion. All in favor of Mr. Matijevich's and Mr. Epton's motion.... lying it on the table...will vote 'aye'; opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 53 'ayes', 81 'nays'. The Gentleman's motion fails. Now we revert to Mr. Epton's motion to reconsider. All those in favor of his motion to reconsider the vote by which 358 passed will vote 'aye', those opposed to the motion will vote 'no'. If you wait just a minute we'll dump this Roll. The question is on the Gentleman's motion to reconsider. All those in favor of this motion will vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. Takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Bartulis to explain his vote."

Bartulis: "At the proper time I would like to poll the absentees on this."

Speaker Bradley: "Fine, Sir. You're entitled to it. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. 85 'ayes', 68 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion, Mr. Bartulis's request....to poll the absentees. Poll the absentees."

Clerk Hall: "Antonovych, Bowman, Bradley, Dawson, Dyer, Ewell, Gaines, Giglio,..."

Speaker Bradley: "Gaines, 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "Bowman."

Speaker Bradley: "Bowman, 'aye'. Bowman wishes to be recorded 'no'."

Clerk Hall: "Hart, Emil Jones, Kane, Kornowicz, Kosinski,



Kucharski, Lechowicz, Martin, Mautino, McGrew, Murphy, O'Daniel, Schoeberlein, Tipsword, Von Boeckman, Mr. Speaker."

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

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my vote from 'yes' to 'no', please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes to 'no'. Yes, Sir. On this question we have 85 'ayes' and 70 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Now we revert to the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, on behalf of the Minority Leader, I should like to introduce to you a former Member of the House, Ronald Hurst from Peoria in the East Gallery. For your information, Ron served one term and during that term sponsored the Fiscal Note Act. Ron Hurst."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bill 364, Mr. Totten, after fifteen minutes. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 364. A Bill for an Act in relation to the number of Judges of Election and amending certain Acts in connection therewith. Third Reading of the Bill."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With leave of the House, I would like to return it to Second Reading and leave it there. There's an Amendment that has not been distributed yet."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, the Bill will be returned to the Order of Second Reading and left that way. House Bill 365, Mr. Walsh. Pardon me, before we get to 365... Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While I was off the floor, there was two measures heard. I would like to be recorded 'yes' on 230 and 'no' and 302."

Speaker Bradley: "Are there objections? Hearing no objections."



the Gentleman will be so recorded."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 365, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Clerk Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill addresses itself to the election or selection by the State Central Committee of delegates to the National Nominating Convention. The law presently is that there are two alternatives that the State Central Committee may use. One is to use a strictly mathematical; that is, the same number of delegates from each Congressional District. The other is to use a proportional system plus....for half of them....plus a strictly arithmetic selection for the other half. This Bill would strike alternative (a), the one that provides for the the same number from each Congressional District and substitute alternative (c), which provides that they shall all be based as a proportion of the Presidential vote in the last preceeding Presidential Election. Last year the State Republican Convention endorsed this idea. Traditionally the Republican State Central Committee has used alternative (a), the Democrats have used alternative (b). We do not touch alternative (b) at all but address ourselves to the traditional Republican alternative. I solicit your support."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Sponsor, if he will yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Brady: "Representative Walsh, it appears to me that not only are you adding an alternative (c) to this piece of legislation, but you are in effect....eliminating alternative (a). As I recall, last Session, there was a Bill introduced by you that did act somewhat similar to this Section (c), but didn't touch Section (a). I don't understand why we are eliminating Section (a) under this.



Could you explain that to me?"

Walsh: "This Bill is identical to the Bill that passed both Houses last year and was Amendatorially Vetoed by Governor Walker. We did, last year, strike alternative (a), in this legislation. Our reason for it, frankly, for striking alternative (a), is so that the State Central Committee cannot use that as a means of selecting delegates.

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm a little bit confused. By striking alternative (a), it leaves only the other two solutions, (b) and (c) for selecting delegates. Under the Section onSection (c), it says that...I'm trying to read the exact lines now. On page five, it says that if this paragraph results in the allocation of zero delegates in a Congressional District, the State Convention shall select as Delegates at Large, at least one qualified elector. It seems to me that under this plan, with eliminating Section (a) the only alternative a party has to go to, in selecting delegates to a convention with the formula Bills in, may eliminate the fact that any Minority Member of a Congressional District, may be entirely eliminated from it. I think I have some serious questions and reservations about this Bill. I'm not in favor of it at this time."

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

Darrow: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Darrow: "Representative Walsh, is this, choice (c), alternative (c), based on population?"

Walsh: "It is based not on population, but on the parties vote in the last preceeding Presidential Election, for President. The Congressional Districts, of course, are based on population."

Darrow: "In other words, if you were a Democrat, this would tend to favor the large metropolitan areas. Is that correct?"



Walsh: "Well, if you were in a predominantly Democratic Congressional District, you would get more Democratic....you would get more delegates than you would if you were not predominantly Democratic.....District.."

Darrow: "And if you were a Republican from downstate, you would have less representation at the National Convention?....
...Moreat the National Convention, if you were downstate. But if you were a city Republican you would have less representation. Is that correct?"

Walsh: "...To answer your question. If you had a specific Congressional District to which you'd like to ask..... about which you'd like to ask that question. In either party, I have a graph here that will give me the answer.. for the last two-party nominating conventions."

Darrow: "You can't give us a 'yes' or 'no' on that, can you? In general?"

Walsh: "You'd have to repeat the question."

Darrow: "All right. To repeat the question. Under your alternative, would the Republicans residing in the City of Chicago have less representation at the National Convention or have more?"

Walsh: "They'd get exactly what they deserve.....Ha.."

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address myself to the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "You certainly may, Sir."

Darrow: "Last Session we had this Bill introduced and Representative Walsh handled it. I feel that...this afternoon...we ought to have Gerald Shea...here. This is the Gerald Shea Memorial Bill sponsored by Representative Walsh. What this does is it gives an extra strong vote at the National Convention to the city Democrats at the expense of the downstate Democrats, to the downstate Republicans at the expense of the city Republicans..... What I would suggest is that we take a closer look at this. The alternative (c) would not only effect the Republican Party but also the Democratic Party. Thank you."



111.

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

Matijevich: "Yeah....Would the Gentleman yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Matijevich: "Representative Walsh, I am looking at the Bill and I'm sure that I know what the intent is but I'm looking at the wording of it. The intent is....in that section which relates to determining the ...either by primary or by convention....state convention...the delegates. That really relates, I guess, to delegates and alternate delegates ...at large, right?"

Walsh: "...Yes....There is an Amendment, John. You mean on page five?"

Matijevich: "Yeah."

Walsh: "There is an Amendment that adds...'at large'. Yes."

Matijevich: "Yeah....I just have the Bill and I didn't look at the Amendment. Because there had to be some clarification. I'm not going to vote for it anyway, but I was hoping, at least, to clarify that."

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

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to brieflyaddress this Bill.. What this is, pure and simply is that our conventions can now be run on the base....our delegates can now be selected on the basis of one person one vote. I don't think that's such an extraordinarily wild, radical, scheme to make sure that a Republican or a Democrat, whoever they may be, vote at the time in the primary election for delegates, is equal to any other Republican in the state. It is not a radical notion. It is a good notion. It makes for a good convention.....representation of delegates and I certainly think this Bill ought to be voted affirmatively by all of the Members of the House who believe that each person's vote ought to be weighed the same as anybody else's vote."

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

Willer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"



Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Willer: "Representative Walsh, you say you have data on specific Congressional Districts. Could you give me the data on the Fourth Congressional District, based on the last Presidential Election, for Republicans and Democrats?"

Walsh: "Yes, I can. In the Fourth Congressional District, the Republicans would have had five. The Democrats would have also had five. Of course you are dealing with more Democratic delegates."

Willer: "Would have had. Now, tell me what they had. I'm sorry."

Walsh: "What they ...what?"

Willer: "You say, they would have had, under alternative (c)."

Walsh: "Using alternative (c) they would have each had five."

Willer: "Well, what did they have?"

Walsh: "The Republicans had four and I believe the Democrats had six."

Willer: "Oh! Shame."

Walsh: "I don't know about the....Democrats...."

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

Yourell: "Will the Gentleman respond to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "I think that he will, yes."

Yourell: "Bill, is it true that....the way I read this, and perhaps I'm wrong, that this Bill doesn't affect the Democratic Convention Delegates at all, does it?"

Walsh: "That's absolutely true. It doesn't affect the method that the Democrats have traditionally used. That's absolutely right."

Yourell: "It just affects the Republican Party."

Walsh: "That's right."

Yourell: "Thank you."

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

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To address myself to the Bill, Representative Yourell has hit the nail on the head. Traditionally what we have done in this General Assembly, when we're working



on purely party matters, is if the Republicans want to do something to their selection process and we have some sort of an agreement on it, we let them do it. This does not affect the Democratic Party at all. You have traditionally used alternative (b), which is in the law. It is still there. The Republican Party, we have traditionally used alternative (a). There are many of us who object to alternative (a) and want to provide alternative (c), which Bill Walsh's Bill does. The Republican State Convention, at their last Convention, last summer, approved the proposal, which is put forth in Representative Walsh's Bill, in House Bill 365. In order to accomplish it, what we suggested in the Legislation, was we eliminate alternative (a), which had been before purely a Republican way of selecting delegates....the Democrats did not use it. In its place we suggest alternative (c), which the Republican Party would like to use. The Democratic Party proposal, alternative (b), remains in tact. Alternative (c), as proposed by Representative Walsh, merely says, one Republican, one delegate, one Democrat, one delegate...if you want to choose to use it. It's purely optional as to which party uses it. The Bill passed out of the House and Senate last year and I see no reason why it shouldn't have everyone's support this year."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan...'J'."

Houlihan, J.: "I wonder if the Sponsor would yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will. Mr. Walsh, we have a question for you, Sir."

Houlihan, J.: "Representative Walsh, did you purposely misspeak yourself when you responded to Representative Yourell's question?"

Walsh: "Well, you know me better than that, Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Was it then out of ignorance?"

Walsh: "You know me better than that...."

Houlihan, J: "It has to be one or the other. I gave you the



benefit of the doubt the first time."

Walsh: "My response to Representative Yourell was that traditionally the Democratic Party has used alternative (b). That was not to suggest that alternative (c) was not available to them. Traditionally, however, they have used alternative (b). I believe that's the way I responded to him."

Houlihan, J.: "But the question was, 'If this legislation is passed, would it be possible for the Democratic Party to change its delegate selection process, or would it be possible for it to change its formula so that there would be a different formula used and a different apportionment of delegates throughout the state? That really was the question."

Walsh: "That was not the question. To answer that question..."

Houlihan, J.: "Representative Walsh, could you answer that question?"

Walsh: "The answer is 'yes'."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.....in the opinion of the Chair. Mr. Walsh to close."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to reinforce, just a little bit, the very cogent argument used by Representative Totten, that being that the two parties have permitted each to do pretty much what they wanted to, in the belief that the two party system is the best system for governing our state and our country. The Republican State Convention endorsed, absolutely, this principle, last year when they met in Oakbrook. Now..... Mr. Speaker, it was also mentioned that this is....by Representative Leinenweber, that this is truly one man, one vote. I'm surprised that in the furor over one man, one vote, a few years ago....that this aspect was overlooked.



There is one Congressional District, for example, in Chicago.....that has one tenth the vote of a Congressional District downstate. Now that district, using alternative (a) gets the same representation at the Republican National Convention as the one that has ten times the Republican vote. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is unfair. This would simply seek to remedy that. I urge your support."

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 Lake, Mr. Matijevich, to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain my vote. I haven't seen any Republican on the horizon that even qualifies to be President in the future, so I don't know why we're wasting all this time."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "Since I am a resident of the district that Mr. Walsh so maligned, I wonder if he saw the legal opinion from the Republican National Committee that said this alternative is illegal. As far as it violates the rules of the Republican National Convention. Yes it is, Mr. Walsh, because I have it. We went over this last year....and the General Council for the Republican National Committee issued, two weeks before the Convention, a legal opinion stating that this was not in.....in line with the Republican National Convention Rules. And when you remove the alternative, which the Republican National Committee says is the one they require, you are then making it impossible for the Republicans to send a qualified delegation. Now if you want your delegation unseated, then of course go ahead with this folly. And, also, in the pretense that the Republican Party wants to be an open party, this would make it a closed party. And we will go



to the United States Supreme Court on this."

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

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first I much confess to a conflict of interest. Obviously, if my distinguished colleague's Bill passes, my district will have no representation. Secondly, I demanded from my distinguished colleague, an apology which he refuses to give. I, publicly...again, on the floor of this House, ask Mr. Walsh to never again state that the Republicans should get what they deserve."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all....the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sandquist, to explain his vote."

Sandquist: "As a Republican from Chicago, and while my district is not quite as bad as Representative Epton's may be or Representative Gaines, I'd like to say that this Bill would not help the Republican Party because what I think we've got to do is grow and to attract more people and that's what our Governor has said and that's what I say and I'm voting against this because it would limit the Republican Party to be limited to a certain group. It would not help us to expand. Therefore, I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Friedrich, I think, would like to explain his, first. We'll come back to you, Mr. Walsh. Mr. Friedrich to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. President....Mr. Speaker.."

Speaker Bradley: "Thank you, Sir."

Friedrich: "....I just wanted to say this is the same system we used to elect County Chairmen. There is nothing new about it. The precincts vote by weighted vote to elect the...chairman of the...county....and I don't see anything wrong with it. I don't know what the people are being disturbed about.....that you use the number of Republican votes in each precinct, as a weighted vote, to elect the



County Chairmen. I think fair is fair."

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

Walsh: "Well, just to respond very briefly to my dear friendsand it just goes to show that if you have enough things you can differ with even very close friends of yours. I refer specifically to Representatives Epton and Gaines and also Sandquist. The Republican Convention, last year, did not adopt rules specifically excluding this method for seating delegates. On the contrary.....they said, 'bring us a state law and let us see what it is and then we will react to it'. Suggesting that indeed they would not ...would not challenge a delegation seated under alternative (c). I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, you can't remember a time when the Republican delegation has not seated an important state like Illinois. There is no time in the future if you give them a reasonable selection or election process that they will do this. Iagain.....urge your support."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 58 'aye', 39 'nays', 59 voting 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. House Bill 396."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 396, a Bill for an Act to require that mobile homes be tied down. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did ask the Speaker if I could hear House Bill 379, with Representative Lech....er.... Kornowicz's Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schuneman, would you object, I knew that Kornowicz was not here and passed.....Would the Clerk please read 379?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 379, a Bill for an Act designating



a design for the Great Seal of the State of Illinois.
Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like leave of the House to bring back House Bill 379 to Second Reading for an Amendment. Originally when the Amendment went on, Amendment #1, it was to cover some technical changes, but due to the paper work involved, the wrong Amendment was adopted. I have Amendment #2..."

Speaker Bradley: "Hearing no objection we'll return the Bill to Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, amends House Bill 379 on page one, line 15 and so forth."

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

Terzich: "Yes, did I have leave to table Amendment #1?"

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave to table Amendment #1? Hearing no objection, Amendment #1 is tabled. We're now on Amendment #2."

Terzich: "Amendment #2 makes the technical changes by this correction and also with the Committee they did request that, with the expressed written permission of the Secretary of State, be included in the Amendment and therefore I move for adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the Gentleman moves the adoption.....The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Madison: "Representative Terzich, Amendment #1 that you just tabled,deleted the severability clause. Does Amendment #2....?"

Terzich: "It does."

Madison: "It does. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Everybody.....All in favor of the Gentleman's ...of Amendment #2 to House Bill 379 say 'aye', opposed



'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. Mr. Schuneman on 396. I think you read it a third time, didn't you Jack?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Bill has been read a third time previously."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 396 would enact the Illinois Mobile Home Tie-down Act. The Act would require that any new mobile homes sold in Illinois after January 1, 1978, be anchored according to rules and regulations to be promulgated by the Department of Public Health. This law would apply to any new mobile homes purchased after January 1, and to any mobile homes moved after that date. It would not effect, in any way, those 138,000 existing mobile homes that are already existing in the state. The Bill has been developed with the cooperation of the Department of Public Health. The Bill had a good hearing in Committee and passed out of Committee on a seventeen to one vote and I would simply ask for a favorable Roll Call on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Prior to the Chair recognizing Mr. Friedland,for the information of the Members, we'd like to announce what the program is going to be. If we can have your attention? We intend to stay in Session, keep on working for a few more hours ...until possibly the hour of eight o'clock and we will be done for the night..... Instead of breaking and coming back; we will continue to work for about three more hours. Now, the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Friedland."

Friedland: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield please?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Friedland: "Representative Schuneman, is Section 6, on page two, of the Bill, is that still in the Bill?"

Schuneman: "Yes it is. It is."



Friedland: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would point out to the Members of the Body, especially those of you that have mobile home parks in your district, that a violation of this Act would be five hundred dollars. That would be of special interest to those of you that would have Members or constituents, many of who are retired and reside in these mobile homes. I would urge you to take a second look at this measure."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schuneman, do you wish to close, Sir?"

Schuneman: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as far as the penalty that was questioned by Representative Friedland. That penalty has existed in the Bill from the inception and from its original introduction. We dealt with several objections of the Mobile Home Dealers Association, in Committee, and on Second Amendment....er....on Second Reading here in the House. I don't think that there has been any strong objection raised to the penalties in the Bill. I would simply remind you of the need for tying down mobile homes....in Illinois. To help avoid some of the deaths and injuries that we have had in this State. Also, to help avoid some of the terrible property damage that has resulted from mobile home destruction in such places as Canton, last year, and other places throughout the state....in each year, because of the windstorm severity and frequency here in the State of Illinois. I think this is legislation that is long overdue. It's legislation that will bring about no particular hardship on anyone and I would urge a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 106 'ayes', 31 'nays', and this Bill having received the Constitutional



Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 397."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 397,....."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Darrow wishes to be recorded as voting 'no' on 396. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections. Mr. Conti wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'..... Johnson, ...'aye'..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 397, a Bill for an Act concerning costs in criminal prosecution, Third Reading of the Bill.

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

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 397 amends the Criminal Code to replace a Section of the Statute which is currently there which is unconstitutional according to the decision of the United States Supreme Court in an Oregon case in 1974. What the Bill provides is that a judge may decide whether a defendant who was indigent at the time of arrest or the inception of the trial, may be required to pay costs for the state expenses in prosecuting the defendant and also at the discretion of the court, expenses incurred by the state in providing counsel for the defendant. It also provides that payment of these costs may be done on installment basis and it may be part of probation ...at the judge's discretion. I would ask for your support of this legislation."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in support of House Bill 397. The present law in Illinois is clearly unconstitutional....in that it makes a mandate. Under the Amendment to our present Statute, as proposed by this Bill, the Statute would be in conformity with a Statute that has been tested in the case of 'Fuller versus Oregon' which has been before the United States Supreme Court. I believe that by enacting this we will have a constitutionally sound piece of legislation and I solicit



your support."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman.....
The Gentleman from Cook.....Mr. Stearney."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates that she will."

Stearney: "Do we not have a Statute on the books which allows
the court to impose a court cost on a criminal defendant
who has been found guilty of a charge?"

Catania: "Right now, Representative Stearney, this section of
the Statutes say 'the court shall give judgment that
the defendant.....'."

Stearney: "That Statute was written in the Nineteenth Century.
Am I right?"

Catania: "It was written in 1874 and as Representative Getty
pointed out it is unconstitutional."

Stearney: "Well, do you know of anyany Circuit Court Judge
in the State of Illinois that has said...that particular
Statute is unconstitutional?"

Catania: "Representative Stearney, I believe they are awaiting
action of the legislature....hoping there won't have to
be any court action to determine this..."

Stearney: "Representative, do you know of any case on appeal...
involving this very same question.....before the Illinois
Appellate Court or the Illinois Supreme Court?"

Catania: "No, Representative Stearney, but perhaps you do. As
I said, I think they are awaiting action of the Legislature
on this subject. I would remind you that this did come
out of the Judiciary II Committee unanimously, I believe,
with your 'yes' vote."

Stearney: "Yes. Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of
the House, in addressing myself to this question, let me
just state some very salient facts. If you were to con-
sider this legislation theoretically it has some merit,
but if you were to consider it practically it has serious
.....very serious drawbacks. Let me give you an example:



Right now, in Cook County in the courts, if a defendant is found guilty the judge imposes court costs, which amount to seventy-nine dollars and he'll levy on the individual's bond. In many cases he'll allow that defendant to pay the bond...that court cost of seventy-nine dollars through probation. Now what you are doing by this Bill is setting up a procedure in which the judge will now have to conduct a hearing...outside of the case itself, in which he is going to determine whether there is manifest hardship to the defendant. Now I can tell you, speaking practically, in the courts in Cook County, the preliminary hearing courts, and the misdemeanor courts, where they have something like thirty to forty cases a day on the call, the judge is not going to conduct a separate hearing, which is going to necessitate ten or fifteen minutes of the court's time to determine if that defendant has suffered a manifest hardship and cannot pay these court costs. Now need I remind you Gentlemen, not only from Cook, but from two other parts of the state. In branch twenty-five, for instance, the Judge, Zelezinski, will take something like twenty pleas a day. Now that amounts to something like sixteen hundred dollars a day which will go into the public treasury. Now if you are going to necessitate a hearing, the court is not going to have this hearing, he'll just dispense with imposing court costs or any other type of costs. Now what that means is that the court...the counties, every county in the State of Illinois, is going to lose a great deal of revenue. I say to you, until this problem is ripe for controversy, and by that I mean there is some litigation here in the State of Illinois contesting the unconstitutionality of our Statutes. We should not be changing it. By changing it, all we're going to do is cause a very... very serious decrease in revenue to the various counties in the State of Illinois by requiring hearings. Hearings which a judge is not going to have time to give up to



dispense with this hearing. So I say to you, the appropriate thing to do in this situation is just not to vote for this Bill. Let's wait until some court in the State of Illinois has said the Statute is unconstitutional. At that time let's resolve it, but this I believe is just another instance where we are legislating for the sake of legislating because our Bill in the State of Illinois is Constitutional at this moment and there is not one case on appeal contesting its...Constitutionality... Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from...Cook, Mrs. Catania, to close. Now....Mr. Schlickman...Pardon me. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman....your light was off andon, now it is on so...."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I don't look at this Bill in terms of whether or not it meets a Constitutional defect in our existing law. I look at the Bill in terms of whether it constitutes sound public policy. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to remove the mandatory imposition on the court to assess costs is unwise, rather it's better to advise the court that it has discretion. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, by expanding the definition of cost to include 'providing defense to an indigent', will, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, provide in the long run additional payment to the state, to the county, for representation that should not have been given initially. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there are no criteria as to the nature of the hearing to be conducted, that too is left within the discretion of the judge. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill was thoroughly considered by Judiciary II, it was reported out by a vote of nineteen to nothing. I urgently....secure....er...solicit your support ...your vote 'aye' for House Bill 397, as amended."



Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania to explain. . .
to close the debate."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.
I would like to clear up a couple of problems with what
the speaker just before the last one said. Apparently he
hasn't read the Bill.....because it does say that the
judgemay...conduct a hearing. It is not necessary
that a separate hearing be held at any time and it does
provide that the defense cost can be paid, if the judge
so decides, by the defendant. This Bill was approved by
the this House last year 122 to nothing. It went to a
Senate Subcommittee from which it unfortunately did not
emerge, but I would ask for your support of this Con-
stitutional legislation."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass. All
those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting
'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania, to explain her vote."

Catania: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I
would like to repeat for anyone who might have missed it, that
what this does is to replace a currently unconstitutional
section of the Statutes, with Constitutional language
which provides that a judge may decide that a defendant,
if the defendant is financially capable, will pay court
costs as well as the cost of defense, which had been
paid by the state. Now it was pointed out by Represen-
tative Schlickman, this will save money because when the
defendants become able to pay the court may decide that
those costs must be borne by the defendant and they can
in fact be made a provision of probation...if the judge
so decides. This is judicial discretion and it is
Constitutional legislation."

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

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was noticing one portion of
the Bill here as I was reading it. This question about



hearings, which seems to have a lot of people worried. I'm reading the Bill and it is on page two, paragraph three, lines twenty-three through twenty-eight. Anyone who reads that and says that the judge does not have to hold a separate hearing, simply is not reading the Bill correctly. It talks a great deal about the worth of the defendant, ability to pay, determinations made by the judge, et cetera. I don't see how he can possibly find that out without she sayshold it....she says (unintelligible) three. Turn over to page three. Turn over to page three, my Dear and read the wording and it specifically says the judge has to find out a list of four different things. There is no way he can ask that in court so I don't really care how you vote but I just want to correct the Sponsor of the Bill that perhaps she should check her own Bill more closely before she says another Member, Representative Stearney, has not read the Bill. Anyone who looks at that beat-up Bill it's obvious he did read it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all....the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijeovich to explain his vote. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 105 'ayes', 34 'nays', this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby is declared passed. House Bill 406."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 406, a Bill for an Act in relation to jurors, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 406 is Sponsored jointly by myself and Representative Bradley. This is permissive legislation. It allows for the summoning of jurors by first-class mail as long as an acknowledgment form providing sufficient proof of service is included. This Bill was introduced at the suggestion of CircuitChief Circuit Judges of several downstate circuits. It has been introduced in a trial



measure in certain counties and it has proven to be successful not only in the summoning of prospective jurors but also in the savings of money. There's a considerable amount of money to be saved in the larger counties. This simply allows them to use this procedure. It is now being used in Champaign County, in Lake County, in St. Clair County, Sangamon County and other large counties in the state. I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Hart: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just rise to support the Lady's motion to pass this Bill. She was kind enough....I had a Bill very similar to this. She was kind enough to come over and suggest that wetake the two Bills and combine them and use this means to pass this legislation. I think it is a good piece of legislation. As she says, it is permissive. It's a possibility of saving some money and making it easier to do the job for the court with this legislation and I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

REPRESENTATIVE HART IN SPEAKER'S CHAIR.....

Speaker Hart: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I voted against this Bill in Committee, not out of any disagreement at all with the Sponsor's intentions or what the Bill ended up doing. But this Bill is the perfect example of why the Illinois Revised Statutes are now four volumes and pretty soon will be five volumes. What could have been very easily legislated in one line is three pages of new material for the Statute Book. So I voted 'no' in Committee on the principle that we've got too many words already in the



Statutes but I'll vote 'present' now. Not with any intention to defeat the Bill.....because the intention is good.....but it's just lousy draftsmanship and I don't blame the Sponsor for that."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl, wish to close?..... Pardon me. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly."

Kelly: "I just would like to ask the Sponsor a question. If you were going to switch to this new system, which would mean that this summons would be mailed out....first-class, what happens if a juror says they never received it? I mean, if it is going by certified mail, at least you know someone is signing for it..... Any problem?"

Stiehl: "No. It,,in fact, the Chief Circuit Judge, of our circuit, that came up....said that his response has been far better by first-class mail than by certified mail. Now....there is a three step process here and basically when the summons goes by first-class mail there's a duplicate card there that they send back. If they have not received that then the clerk has the alternative of either going directly to certified mail orah..... summoning by the sheriff."

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

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just wanted to remind my seatmate that the reason that the Statute is so wordy isthe lawyers draw most of the Bills."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl, to close the debate."

Stiehl: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just ask for an affirmative vote. This has been a very successful program and it's been a pilot program and many of the circuits would like to use it permanently."

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 wish? Have all voted who wish?"



The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 154 'ayes', no 'nays', 4 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 428..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 428, a Bill for an Act in relation to the effective date of laws."

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

Bluthardt: "Thank you. What happened to 427, Gerry? Anyhow.. 428 is a Bill that would change the effective date of laws. Presently the effective date of any Act passed by the General Assembly and not having an effective date, and passed before July 1, is October 1, of that year. Many of our municipalities...the attorneys for municipalities...have run into difficulty because ...many of our legal publications don't come out until late October or November. This would change the effective date on Bills that don't have an otherwise effective date, to January 1....giving council more time to study the Bills and to put them into effect. I move the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by votingThe Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "I just had one question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he'll yield."

Mugalian: "What will this do to those that have already passed,where the Sponsors did not know that? This might affect their Bills in a way they didn't expect."

Bluthardt: "Ordinarily very few Bills would be affected because ...one.....they do have an effective date in the Bill itself. Two, I don't suppose that this will get around to being enacted and signed by the Governor to affect many Bills this year. In fact, I don't even know what the effective date on this Bill is."



Mugalian: "Oh! I suppose that this Bill wouldbe subject to its own provisions and not be effective until January 1.....and that way we're off the hook.....maybe?"

Bluthardt: "I suppose. If that's the way you want to read it."

Mugalian: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Houlihan: "What is the reason for changing what would be the effective date of October 1, to January 1?"

Bluthardt: "Well, I thought I explained that....and apparently I didn't....satisfactorily. Many legal publications do not come out until October,November. As a result some municipal attorneys have run into difficulty. For instance Bloomington found out only a month or so after that they were required by change of the law, to withhold certain increase in pension funds and it made for a very unhappy bunch of police and firemen when they had their withholdings taken out doublea month later. It would just merely give an additional three months to prepare and get ready for the change in law....in those small number of Acts that don't have any effective date in the Act itself."

Houlihan: "What municipality did you say, Sir?"

Bluthardt: "Bloomington."

Houlihan: "Thank you."

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

Geo-Karis: "I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Geo-Karis: "Representative, do I understand that by your Bill unless there is a date set forth in the Bill, any Bill, under your Bill, passed prior to July 1 of let's say this year, would not take effect until January 1 of next year?"

Bluthardt: "That's correct."



Geo-Karis: "I'd like to speak on the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Sponsor already has articulated some very cogent reasons for the passage of this Bill. I happen to be a municipal attorney myself and I can honestly tell you that this Bill would clear up an awful lot of doubts. I certainly suggest that a favorable.....passage of tis Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Bluthardt to close."

Bluthardt: "I think enough has been said. I would appreciate an affirmative vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 154 'ayes', 4 'nays', 6 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Regarding 427, Mr. Bluthardt, that Bill was taken back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment earlier in the day. Practice of the Chair is to not call that for Third Reading the same day."

Bluthardt: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bill 444."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 444, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to promote the welfare of wage warners by regulating the assignment of wages and prescribing a penalty for the violation thereof, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

McLendon: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is another Bill that is Sponsored and put in at the request of the Illinois State Bar Association and the Chicago Bar Association. It came out of the Committee, Judiciary I, nineteen to nothing. It merely brings the state law into conformity with the federal law with respect to wage assignments. I ask the approval of the House."



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 wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 134 'ayes', 8 'nays' and 18 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 449."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 449, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 449 is a fairly simple Bill, it addresses itself to those municipalities between two thousand population and twenty-five thousand population that are now not home rule units. The purpose is to mandate that they hold some kind of a hearing either before adopting their annual appropriation ordinance or ...the ordinance ...it gives them two options as amended. Two Amendments were adopted. Originally the Bill said before an annual appropriation ordinance. The Municipal League questioned both the wisdom of having this mandated for municipalities under two thousand so we added an Amendment on Second Reading that excludes them. The other one wasit said the Municipal League was uneasy about any reference to a budget being put in the Statutes since some municipalities have an appropriation document upon which they base their budget, so it now gives them two options. They can hold a public hearing on the annual appropriation ordinance or on an appropriation document upon which the annual appropriation ordinance will be based. They must do one or the other. I did this because municipalities are the only unit of local government that have no hearing prior to the adoption of their budget. It's a very simple



Bill. I think it's necessary for those municipalities that it covers and I would urge your support."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "I.....speak in opposition to this Bill. I can recall just a few years back when this ...almost puts this the, same as holding town hall meetings, which is antiquated at this time.....but it's still required by law... Where the annual town board meeting has to be held once a year and the general public participates. There's some eighteen thousand people in unincorporated areas. This includes municipalities from five thousand to twenty-five thousand. Some of their budgets and some of the budgets of the municipalities under twenty thousand, in the City of Chicago, run as high as eight and nine million dollars. And to try to hold a public hearing in a civic hall large enough....in the community would almost be impossible. I can't see any need for this Bill. Before the budget or the appropriation is passed, it is published in the local newspapers, by Statute we have to do that anyhow, if you start getting citizen participation into the intricacies ofappropriating for various departments, I'm afraid that your public hearings and your budgets wouldn't be passed until after the fiscal year ends. At least sixty to ninety days after they end. No governmental agency would be able to cope with some public harassments or political harassments from either party in trying to detain the passing of a budget. I can see where ...we had a problem like this once before and I can see where this can open up a new 'Pandora's Box' for municipalities as well as it does for these large unincorporated areas that still have to hold town board meetings."

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

Matijevich: "Yes. Would the Lady yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates she will."



Matijevich: "Yes, Representative Willer. You mentioned that the municipalities are the only local governments that do not now require public hearings on the appropriation ordinance. Do the townships now....?"

Willer: "Townships, school districts, park districts, all must hold a hearing prior to the adoption of their appropriation ordinance. I must say that it would be nice if we thought that people would turn out in such large numbers. The sad fact of the matter is that they don't. I don't think they will under this. The only unit of local government that do not....."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak very briefly. I've always been one who believes in the openness and the ability for people to be involved in the public process. But really the matter of public hearings on the appropriation ordinance has not worked. People do not attend. The public doesn't really understand the appropriation process.I really think that we're not going to serve the public any better. All we're going to do is really involve more spending by meetings that really aren't going to contribute at all to good government. The people have a good way, when they are dissatisfied with the appropriation process; that is to get rid of their local officials who do not do a good job with that process. So I'm going to vote against the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman....the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A couple of questions. Would this also effect supplemental appropriations? Would there be a public hearing required, under your Bill, I mean....supplemental?"

Willer: "No. This is just the annual."

Bluthardt: "How about the question as to whether or not this preempts home rule, and whether you need 107 votes to pass?"



Willer: "This does not effect home rule units."

Bluthardt: "It effects communities or municipalities between twenty-five hundred and five hundred thousand. Is that correct?"

Willer: "No. No.....I'm sorry. It is between two thousand and twenty-five thousand. Anybody over twenty-five thousand comes under a different law. So it's really the smaller municipalities."

Bluthardt: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak against the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

Bluthardt: "It's difficult enough to meet and hold budget hearings that take a day or a day and a half for a small municipality of say fifteen thousand...such as I represent. We have people coming in and out all day presenting their budgets for the various departments of our municipalities. Those meetings are open to the public. But to require public hearings, it seems to me to increase the bureaucracy and the requirements andto make it very difficult for local government to operate.....and operate efficiently. I don't really see any need or any demand for this. I can see that the only ones who are really going to show up will be around election time ...the election year... to make politics out of your budget rather than to....gain information and to be helpful in adopting a budget for the municipality. I've got to question whether or not the small municipalities under twenty thousand....are the only ones who are not required to adopt budgets. I don't believe that....I don't remember school boards being required to hold public hearings to adopt a budget. I may be wrongbut I've never heard of it. I don't know of any library board that is required to hold public hearings to adopt their budget. I'm sure there are other units of government that are not. I don't think a cemetery board is required to do it....or a water district. So I think the young lady is mistaken when she says that



....small municipalities are the only ones not required to adopt budgets. Furthermore, the law does require the publication of budgets. We will then add to the cost of the publication of that budget, that appropriation ordinance, the cost of publishing notice of a public hearing and theI just think that the whole concept is bad and this Bill ought to be defeated."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question.

All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer to close the debate."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm really amazed to hear Mayors speaker against this. Maybe they don't want to be bothered by people asking them questions. ...Yes, schools must have their budgets on view for a couple of weeks before the hearings so that anyone can come in and look at it and ask in-depth questions. I have done this. My own municipality of nine thousand population has voluntarily held these hearings prior to the adoption of their appropriation ordinance. So, okay, fifteen to twenty people may show up, but they are the ones in the village who are interested in what their officials are doing. It's not any kind of a field day. They are not being hassled. They simply ask questions. I think it protects the municipal officials because when people go to them and say, 'Why are you spending this or that?' after they have adopted it, they can then say in turn, 'Well, look...we had a hearing. Where were you?' I don't think that people are out to just come around politicking just before election time. It doesn't work that way in my village and I suspect the suburban villages are very much the same. Either people participate or they don't. You want them to or



you don't. You can say 'get away. You've elected me. Now leave me alone. We'll run the village. We're running this ballot the way we want. No input by you. I would remind you that our cemetery district is not a unit of local government in the same sense. It is a taxing district. I was not talking about a special taxing district. I think it is a good Bill. I don't think it is going to cause any chaos in our municipalities. I think it simply means 'yes we do want to hear how you want your money spent.' I would ask your support."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'.The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar, to explain his vote."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Bill. It had extensive hearings in Cities and Villages. Was amended to satisfy some of the problems that some of us had. What it simply saysI think is thata public hearing...the local...city council or village board to have a public hearing. Now while they are going through the process of their budget, they are having a lot of meetings and that sort of thing. When they get their budget altogether, before they finally put the budget together they have a public hearing to give the citizens a chance to see what's in it....and make a comment or two and possibly make some corrections or changes if so necessary. I think that most municipalities...at least the ones that I've been associated with already do this on a voluntary basis. So we're not really changing anything, but just opening it up to every municipality and saying that somewhere along the line they must hold a public hearing on their budget so those one or twenty or forty people who might want to come and ask a question have the opportunity before it finally passes. I think it is a good Bill. I think



we should get more green lights on the board. I don't think it hurts local government any way, shape or form."

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

Dunn, John: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to point out that those who say we don't need to have a public hearing...I think, are missing the point and are a little bit out of contact with the folks back home. What the folks back home are most afraid of is that we will do something out of their sight. They want to know that we're doing things out in the open. If you have a budget hearing on your appropriation ordinance in your local municipality, sure there won't be very many people show up. Because they'll know that things are out in the open. They'll know the media is there. They'll know that anyone that wants to can show up....so that the public officials of the municipality had better be on their guard to come forward with all of the facts. So what happens is ...not many people do show up and the communities that do have these public hearings find that it's no problem. I served four years on the city council myself. We had them every year. There is no problem with these.... with these....hearings. As a matter of fact they're excellent public relations and I think we're making a mistake if we don't support this Bill."

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

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish that those who have voted red or who haven't voted yet, would just consider just for a moment voting green on this Bill. Now this is not a monumental Bill ...but it's also not a merely Bill. It's really a good government proposal. It's not going to cost any substantial amount of money. It's going to increase....it's going to encourage people to participate in local government. We talk about the importance of the



government that's closest to you. I'm surprised to see some of my friends who are Mayors ...or involved in local government ...voting 'no' on this Bill. That really helps get them off the hook. They can say 'Where were you when we had that public hearing?' Moreover, it would assist the village corporate authorities in making a better preparation of their appropriation ordinance because they would know there would be some questions. I just can't see why there aren't 125 to 150 green votes on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 84 'ayes' and 49 'nays'Mrs. Willer?"

Willer: "Yes, will you poll the absentees, please?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady requests a poll of the absentees. We'll poll the absentees. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, arise?"

Conti: "I'd like to rise in a point of personal privilege.... As long as mayors were made reference to here....that she's shocked and surprised. Mrs. Willer wasAnn was..... Willer....I'm sorry, was on the League of Women Voters when the Village of Elmwood Park won the All America City Award three times....because of citizen participation. We're not afraid of citizen participation. We want it. But we certainly can't have people coming in and trying to explain to them a budget of four hundred and forty thousand dollars for one department. Another budget of eight hundred thousand dollars for another department and there isn't any school board that I know that holds public hearings on it. We hold an open meeting and we read our budget besides having it published. So I don't want anyone to get the idea that these Mayors are trying to keep something from the general public. I don't think there is more of an open meeting than any village in the suburbs of Cook County, the open meetings that we have, and the hearings that we have on these budgets...plus the printing and the publication



in every paper."

Speaker Bradley: "The Clerk will poll the absentees. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, arise?"

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I did have my light on before the debate closed. I did want to explain my vote about this good Bill. I would hope that in the poll of the absentees that Mrs. Ann Willer would get the necessary vote in order to pass this good Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Boucek, Brandt, Don Brummet, Capparelli, Deavers, DiPrima, Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Farley, Flinn, Friedrich, Garmisa, Hudson, Huff, Emil Jones, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kucharski, Lauer, Lucco, Peggy Smith Martin, Meyer, Mudd, Nardulli, Peters, Schisler, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Shumpert, Terzich, Tipsword, Von Boeckman,Mr. Shumpert...Shumpert..."

Shumpert: "How am I recorded, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "How is he recorded?"

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

Shumpert: "Vote me 'aye'."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Von Boeckman, and Wikoff...."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Farley, for what purpose do you arise?"

Farley: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

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

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "How is he recorded?"

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

Garmisa: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Vote him 'aye'.....McLendon?"

McLendon: "I'm recorded as voting 'present', would you please change that to 'aye', Mr. Speaker?"



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

Mr. Brummet wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Huff wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. On this question we have 90 'ayes' and the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "I'd like a verification of the affirmative vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman requests a verification. Mr. Von Boeckman wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. He was not voting. Mr. Kozubowski wishes to go from 'no' to 'aye'. That's 92 'aye' votes. The Gentleman requests verification. All Members be in their seats. The Clerk will call the Affirmative Roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams, Anderson, Antonovych, E. M. Barnes, Beatty, Bennett, Bradley, Brady, Breslin, Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Catania, Chapman, Christenson, Darrow, Corneal Davis, John Dunn, Edgar, Epton, Ewell, Farley, Gaines, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giglio, Greiman, Griesheimer, Harris, Hoffman, Holewinski, Jim Houlihan, Huff, Jaffe, Dave Jones, Kane, Katz, Kelly, Kempiners, Kozubowski, Leinenweber, Leverenz, Levin, Luft, Macdonald, Madigan, Madison, Mahar, Mann, Marovitz, Lynn Martin, Matejek, Mautino, McCourt, McLendon, McPike, Molloy, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, O'Brien, Pechous, Pierce, Polk, Porter, Pouncey, Pullen, Reed, Reilly, Rigney, Robinson, Sandquist, Satterthwaite, Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert, Simms, Skinner, Stanley, Stearney, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Van Duyn, Von Boeckman, Walsh, Willer, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Questions of the Affirmative Roll? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman. For what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Schlickman: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Schlickman: "Record me as voting 'aye', please."



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

Questions of the Affirmative Roll. Turn...."

Conti: "Mr. Anderson."

Speaker Bradley: "Anderson? Mr. Anderson in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Conti: "Mr. Bennett?"

Speaker Bradley: "Bennett is in his chair."

Conti: "Brady?"

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Brady is in the center aisle."

Conti: "Corneal Davis?"

Speaker Bradley: "He is sitting right here, Sir."

Conti: "I don't want to belabor this but Hanahan has made a rule here not too long ago ...it makes it a little easier for me to follow if they are all sitting in their chair.

Speaker Bradley: "I think that's a good point, Sir. Mr. Skinner, if you would return to your chair and Members will be in their seats...Mr. Skinner."

Conti: "Epton."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Epton is not in his chair. Is he in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Conti: "Farley?"

Speaker Bradley: "Wait just a minute, let's take him off the Roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "Okay."

Conti: "Farley?"

Speaker Bradley: "He is in his seat. He is in the rear. Stand up, Bruce."

Conti: "Kelly?"

Speaker Bradley: "He is not in his chair. Is he in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll. For what purpose does



the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson, arise?"

Hudson: "How am I recorded?"

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

Hudson: "Vote me 'no', please."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Emil
Jones, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Jones, Emil: "How am I recorded, Sir?"

Speaker Bradley: "How is he recorded?"

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

Jones, Emil: "Vote me 'aye'."

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

Boucek: "Mr. Speaker, will you record me as voting 'aye'?"

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman, Mr. Boucek, as voting
'aye'. Mr. Epton has returned to the chamberput him
back on the Roll. Mr. Katz wishes to be verified. Mr.
Conti, is that all right with you?"

Conti: "Fine....fine.. Mr. Greisheimer?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Greisheimer is not in his seat. Is he
in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll. Mr. Mahar would like
to be verified, Mr. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Giglio?"

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, Sir. Who did you ask..."

Conti: "Mr. Giglio..?"

Speaker Bradley: "Giglio..."

Conti: "Mr. Giglio is not in his seat."

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Conti: "Mr. Hoffman....Mr. Hoffman is in here..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Leinenweber, for what purpose do you arise,
Sir?"



Conti: "Mr. Hoffman?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, change me from 'aye' to 'present'."

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

Conti: "Mr. Hoffman....Gene....in the assembly?"

Speaker Bradley: "Gene Hoffman? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Conti: "Mr. Polk?"

Speaker Bradley: "Wait, just a minute, let's take him off the..

Roll. Mr. Hoffman,Gene Hoffman. Mr. Deavers wishes to be recorded as 'no'...."

Conti: "Mr. Polk?"

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Conti: "Mr. Hoffman..."

Speaker Bradley: "We took Gene Hoffman..."

Conti: "You took him off already..."

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

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, change my vote from 'aye' to 'present'."

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

Conti: "Mr. Madigan?"

Madigan: "Right here."

Conti: "Mr. Molloy."

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

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I believe I'm recorded as voting 'no' Change it to 'aye'."

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

Unknown: "Who was that?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Lechowicz was recording 'aye'.

Mr. Domico wishes to be recorded as going from 'no' to 'aye'."



Conti: "Mr. Molloy?"

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute, Mr. Conti, we'd better

Mr. Doyle was recorded as voting 'no'. How do you wish to be recorded, Sir? Turn Mr. Doyle on. Mr. Doyle, do you wish to be recorded as voting 'aye'? Change from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Doyle, 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Walsh: "For the purpose of changing from 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Walshrecorded as 'no'. Mr. Molloy.. is not in his seat. Is he in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Conti: "Mr. Dawson?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Dawson? Turn Mr. Dawson on."

Dawson: "Please change my vote from 'no' to 'aye', please."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Mr. Gene Hoffman has returned to the chamber. We'll put him back on the Roll. Further questions?"

Conti: "Pierce. Mr. Pierce?"

Speaker Bradley: "Pierce is in his seat. Mr. Johnson, the Gentleman from Champaign, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "How is he recorded?"

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

Johnson: "Change me to 'yes'."

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

Conti: "Mr. Sharp."

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich...."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Please record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'."

Conti, who did you ask, Sir? Mr. Sharp is standing next to Mrs. Willer."

Conti: "Mr. Boucek?"



Speaker Bradley: "Boucek, washere. He's not in his chair.
How is Mr. Boucek recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Is he in the chambers? Take him off the Roll."

Conti: "Mr. Stearney? I see him in his seat now. Is that
Stearney there?"

Speaker Bradley: "Stearney is there, yes. The Gentleman from
Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, can you tell me what the rule would be
for an individual who was not recorded electronically,
but who stood up and asked that he be recorded as 'aye'...
is that...can he later be taken off the Roll?"

Speaker Bradley: "State your question again, Sir."

Madison: "An individual who did not appear on the Roll Call,
but asked to be voted as 'aye'...can he then be taken
off the Roll?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, Sir."

Madison: "He is not in effect verified?"

Speaker Bradley: "He is not verified. No, Sir."

Madison: "Thank you."

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

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, please change me from 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Change him to 'no'. On this question we
have 90 'ayes', 48 'nays',this Bill having received
the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.
House Bill 464....Pardon me. The Gentleman from Peoria,
Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to request the House for
leave to be recorded as 'no' on House Bill 65. It will
not change the outcome."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no
objection, the Gentleman will be recorded as voting
'no' on House Bill 65. House Bill 464..."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 464, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Von Boeckman, the Gentleman from Tazewell."

Von Boeckman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is merely a Bill to cleanup and make good government. This takes away the appointment powers of the ...the... merit board of the Sheriff's and turns it over to the county officers...the County Board, which had that previously in 1972. I was one of the men who voted for this measure in 1972. Now that the Sheriffs can succeed themselves I feel it is high time that we change it back so that the deputy sheriffs can have a fair shake when they come before a merit board. I solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall this Bill pass? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Simms: "Representative Von Boeckman, could you tell me what the reason is for changing the present structure of the appointment in the merit board to the County Board, rather than the Sheriff?"

Von Boeckman: "Well, we've had problems in my county for one, and it was brought to my attention by various people that ...a man with this much power...he then becomes the judge, the prosecutor and the jury, because we have for instance, in our hometown...my hometown ...the County Sheriff had the power to appoint. He did and when his appointment did not go along with the merit...with his thinking on discharging an employee, he...in the following turn, when this man came up for reappointment, did not reappoint him. He was a man from his own party. Now this is why I feel that it is time that we give the people



of the State of Illinois fair government. I personally feel thatthis does not affect every county in the State of Illinois. It only affects fifteen counties which are under the merit system. I feel this is one of the better Bills that's been presented this term."

Simms: "Those fifteen counties are the large counties in the state, right?"

Von Boeckman: "Right. That come under the merit system. It does not affect Cook County. It does not affect home rule counties."

Simms: "In essence it does affect the other large downstate counties, Winnebago, Peoria, Sangamon....Is it not the policy, under the state law now that the Sheriff....when he appoints, do not the board members have to have the approval of the County Board for appointment?"

Von Boeckman: "Correct. But still yet they were appointed by the Sheriff. He is their person."

Simms: "Right. But they still have to go to the County Board for their approval?"

Von Boeckman: "Correct."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I could address myself to the Bill?"

Von Boeckman: "Proceed, Sir."

Simms: "I think that we're trying to deal with a situation in perhaps one county that can well effect the other large counties in the State of Illinois that have been operating somewhat successfully under the present system. Winnebago County was the first county downstate to institute the merit system of selection of deputy sheriffs under the Rosander Bill back in 1966. We've had both Republican and Democratic Sheriffs in Winnebago County and we've had no problem and I was unaware that there was any problem in any of the other counties regarding the individuals on the merit board. I think we may be addressing ourselves to one particular county problem and penalizing the other



fourteen counties that do not have the problem. For this reason, because I have not received any type of communication regarding the necessity of changing the present system, I would urge that this legislation not be passed by the House asI think we're just making a shotgun approach to something that may be a personality type problem in one of the counties or should be addressed by the people of that county by electing a different Sheriff.....for a different method of choosing County Board members. The County Boards do have the right to check the appointment of the Sheriff under the present system so I would urge that the Legislature not penalize the other fourteen large countiesjust for the sake of one county problem."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I spoke in behalf of this legislation when in my county we had a Republican Sheriff and I thought it was good legislation because I thought that there shouldn't be that conflict as between the Sheriff and the power that a Sheriff has in the appointments to the merit board. We now have a Democratic Sheriff in Lake County and I still think it's good legislation. We really had this type of legislation on the books until we had a powerful lobbying effort by the Sheriff's lobby and that's the problem where we have to change good law into bad law and then we need now...other legislation to get back to what is good law. I think it makes more sense if the County Board be that agency to make such appointments so that we have that division that it be merit and we not allow the Sheriff to use the power that he has to name the appointments. I think Representative Von Boeckman has a good Bill in spite of the fact probably in my county the Sheriff may be opposed to it. I think it's just good legislation so we really do have truly a merit



board."

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

Johnson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think that probably the direction of this Bill has been somewhat misconstrued. Under the existing system the appointments are made by the Sheriff, subject to the approval of the full County Board....so that we are really not shifting something from one entity to the other, we're simply allowing the different elements that would control and would be effected by this particular Commission to have input into it. So that the County Board Chairman as well as the other members of the County Board have the power to review the appointments of the Sheriff. I think this is the best of both worlds because it not only frees the Merit Commission from control by the Sheriff but it also frees it from control absolutely by the County Board or the members of the County Board. So that I think this is the best of both worlds. There's no chance, depending upon a particular political makeup of either one, for any kind of abuse, even if there is one party in control or not. I think it's not included in any of the analyses that I've seen but it's an important factor to consider when we are determining who's supposed to make the appointments. I think that the laws as currently constitutedis just fine and I think this change is unnecessary and would do many of the negative things that it is supposedly trying to cure."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to echo, Mr. Speaker, those comments by Representative Simms and Representative Johnson. I think this Bill is a negative Bill. I have no qualms about giving this kind of authority, this kind of decision making to the Sheriff of Macon County. Not only those who have served before the present Sheriff but the present Sheriff at the time. Let's not forget this man



is the man elected by all of the people of our particular county, not a certain district as you'll find in your County Board members. This man also is an expert, he is a chief law enforcement officer of that county. He is held accountable for those decisions in law enforcement, and with the present system working well throughout, I think, most of the entire state, we certainly have no business in changing a workable system now. I urge a 'no' vote on this particular Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Von Boeckman to close."

Von Boeckman: "Well again, Mr. Speaker, a lot of times it takes one incident to bring a piece of legislation to light. It took this bad apple to prove that one apple can spoil the whole barrel. It brought to light to me the fact that to have good legislation that was changed in 1972, which I readily admit I supported because of the lobbyists of the Sheriffs and being a former deputy sheriff. I sincerely believeif we want good government in Illinois that this is one of the avenues we'll have to address ourself to and that's to divorce the Sheriff from any way being involved in the merit system. I urge your support."

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 wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 66 'ayes' and 46 'nays', the Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "I'd like to have a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman has that right. We'll poll the absentees. We understand there is a storm outside, we thought we might be able to see it.... The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Cunningham: "Switch me to 'aye' to get my friend Jim up to 70."



Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Beatty wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Totten....'aye'. Kelly...'aye'. Leverenz...'aye'. Jimmy Taylor...'aye'. Geo-Karis.....Turn the Lady on."

Geo-Karis: "Change my 'no' to 'aye', Sir."

Speaker Bradley: "Change her from 'no' to 'aye'. McPike...'aye'. Satterthwaite...'aye'. Peters..."

Peters: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Bradley: "How is he recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Peters: "Vote me 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Mr. Mudd,...the Gentleman from Peoria. "

Mudd: "I would think, Mr. Speaker, if there is a lot of people who are changing their votes in order to give Representative Von Boeckman the opportunity to place his Bill on Postponed Consideration..but I hope very seriously that we're not giving him enough votes to pass this Bill.... because he has asked for a poll of the absentees and I think that was to give him enough to put it on Postponed, I'd sure hate to see us change enough votes to pass this very bad Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Clerk will poll the absentees and while we're waiting...the Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Put it on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Bradley: "We'll put the Bill on Postponed Consideration. For the information of the Members there seems to be a storm and a tornado threat. The squawk boxes are out all over the Capitol Complex and we are prepared though, we have a candle. That's the situation as we understand itright now...and the weather is very severe. We will continue to work. House Bill 480."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 480, a Bill for an Act to require parental consent or a court order before a minor child under eighteen years of age, who has not been married,



can undergo an abortion operation. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an Act to require either parental or a court order before a minor child, under eighteen years of age, who is not married, may undergo an abortion operation. House Bill 480 states that it is the intent of the General Assembly to do three things. One, to respect the rights and responsibilities of parents. Secondly, that the health and welfare of minors and their unborn children be protected. Thirdly, that no minor child, who is not married, shall be allowed to undergo an abortion operation without the consultation or/and consent of her parents, or a court order, as part of the informed consent of the minor child seeking the abortion. I might say that the purpose of this law ...or this Bill, is to protect minors and to look out for little children...they really are, they are children. In many other aspects of Illinois law and law all over the nation, we protect minors. For example, a minor may not change his or her name without the consent of the parents. A minor may not become married without the consent to the parents. A minor, incidentally who is pregnant, may secure a court order to become married. A minor may not get a driver's license or undergo many medical, dental or surgical procedures and as many have said, a minor can't have her ears pierced without the consent of her parents. She may not get birth control information or products without parental consent ...or own a firearm or enlist in the militia. In many many ways we protect minors. But unfortunately, right now, the state of the law in Illinois is wide open and there is no protection for the minors. Your teenage daughter and mine could go to an abortion clinic and secure an abortion without you even knowing about it. Before the Judiciary Committee, a



doctor from Chicago, Doctor Jasper Williams, testified that on one occasion he received a call from the mother who ...he called the mother to come and identify the body of this child. She said, 'No, my daughter is in school.' He said, 'No, I'm sorry. She is not.' She had gone to an abortion clinic. The family knew nothing about it. The operation was not a success and she died. I believe that this Bill is understood. We had some discussion of it yesterday. I would like to answer any questions but ...conclude by saying that the reasons.... one reason for the Bill is that Missouri had a law and we had a law requiring parental consent period, without any court order and in the 'Danfers' case, by a five to four margin, the United States Supreme Court said that giving parents an absolute veto was unconstitutional. I think that this law coupling the initial requirement that parents consent.....and if they do not, provision for an expeditious court order, that this will satisfy the Supreme Court. It's hard to look into a crystal ball but a close reading of the 'Danfers' case indicates that a majority of the court, and I am reading from the opinion of a Federal Judge in Michigan, who issued an opinion in respecting that ...that said that this Bill would be Constitutional. I thank you for your...."

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

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm going to support House Bill 480. As amended, this Bill does give parents the right to participate in the abortion decision. As you know in 1975 we did pass the Abortion Act of 1975 and in that law there was a provision for parental consent. It's my feeling and the feeling of the Sponsors that this particular Bill is more in line with what the Supreme Court would look favorably upon....and that it would, in fact, strengthen the abortion law in Illinois. Now,there is a provision which says that a child



can get an abortion without the mother...without the parent's consent, if that child's life might be in danger. This particular proposal, as amended, is endorsed by the Illinois Right to Life Society, and Illinois Citizen's Concern for Life and I would ask you particularly those that are leaning toward pro-life, to support this House Bill 480, as amended."

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

Beatty: "The Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Beatty: "Representative Deuster, doesn't this Bill, actually in a sense,say that the Legislature of Illinois approved abortion, as long as there is parental consent or approval of a court?"

Deuster: "Representative Beatty, as we have discussed this, it is my feeling that it does not. This is a restrictive abortion provision. If we stood still and sat on our hands and did nothing. The door is wide open. There is no control whatsoever. This is restrictive. This reflects our feeling that it is wrong for the minors to go out and do this and we're trying to tighten it up. I don't construe it that way at all. My motivation is to protect the minors and respect the right and responsibilities of the parents and I'm sure that most parents I know would not permit an abortion....but that's..... I don't think....they'll look at it that way, Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "You don't think in a few years people will look at the Statute and say, 'Well the men in the Legislature felt that as long as mom or dad said it was all right, or the court said it was all right, I guess abortions are all right.'.....?"

Deuster: "I don't think so and I think you and I would be right in here to change the law if that took place."

Beatty: "Could you tell me, in the previous law that was passed



that was found unconstitutional, was this provision in there ...about parental consent? Have we voted on this previously?"

Deuster: "Yes, but what I said is that our law was like the Missouri law that said that parents alone had the decision. If they said 'no', that was final. The court knocked that outso we have to do something else and we believe that if we allow, as an alternative, ...whereparental consent is not allowed....that they can go in and get a court order...that that would satisfy the court and we'd have Constitutional restrictions on what is now wide open freedom for the minors to go out to a clinic without the parents knowing."

Beatty: "So you don't think that this is really any change of the Illinois Legislature in its attitude toward abortions? You don't think it's a loosening up? You think it's merely to confine and get these youngsters toto cut down on the number of abortions that youngsters under eighteen will be having."

Deuster: "Absolutely."

Beatty: "Thank you."

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

Madison: "Representative Deuster, I have not read the Bill but I'm looking at the Synopsis and I'm wondering if you can tell me whether or not your Bill refers to parent and or legal guardians or simply parents?"

Deuster: "Yes. I'll read the provisions. In order for a minor to get an abortion, of course it has to be done by a ...consenting physician in the exercise of his best clinical medical judgment. Secondly, the minor must consent. Thirdly, consent of the parents...and this says that if one of the parents has died and so forth....are not available, the consent of the minor's guardian or other persons standing in loco parentis....is sufficient. So that it is true that a guardian or a person that is actually



standing in loco parentis would be sufficient."

Madison: "Thank you. Representative,we have had before usand I'm sorry, I can't recall whether we passed that Bill or not, but we had before us the Emancipation of Minors Act. If that Bill does become law, how would an emancipated minor be treated under this Act?"

Deuster: "I think this is a special. . . .you are dealing with a special subject of abortion which is peculiar and separate from other matters such as entering into contract or leasing an apartment or something. I think this law would prevail in that case."

Madison: "But if I understand the provisions of the Emancipation of Minors Act. . . .Representative, it gives to a minor who has been emancipated under court order, all the rights that an adult would have. I would presume that would include the right to an abortion. Would he be precluded from exercising that right under this Bill or would we have a conflict of Statutes. . . .or what?"

Deuster: "I think this Bill would prevail because it specifically provides procedures relating to abortion."

Madison: "So even if an individual were emancipated under the Emancipation of Minors Act, he would not be able to exercise the right of abortion without . . .without parental consent or a court order, under your Bill? In other words, as it relates to abortion, he would not be emancipated? He or she would not be emancipated?"

Deuster: "That is my understanding, although that's just another Bill. I don't know what the status of it is, Representative Dyer, I believe, is the Sponsor."

Madison: "Yes."

Deuster: "But that is my understanding that this would prevail."

Madison: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle. Mr. Stuffle. Turn Mr. Stuffle on."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, the debate may change some



but I don't think it will change any votes and I would move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.. Mr. Deuster to close."

Deuster: "The Bill is well understood. I'd appreciate your affirmative vote to protect the rights of parents and to protect minors. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is shall this Bill pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 120 'ayes', 17 'nays', 14 voting 'present', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 485..."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 485 a Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Business Corporation Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Take it out of the record. Request of the Sponsor. Four nine zero...."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 490, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Illinois Municipal Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Skinner. Mr. Rigney, are you handling this Bill...490, Mr. Skinner'syour Bill?"

Rigney: "House Bill 490 is a very simple Bill. It merely allows two counties that have formed an Educational Service Region, when they find out that those two counties are no longer compatible, it gives them a means to dissolve that partnership and then presumably they will seek other counties to join up with in some kind of an alliance. It does not, for instance, reduce the requirements for the thirty-three thousand population."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."



Ebbesen: "Yes,Representative Rigney, what two counties are these?"

Rigney: "It could be any two counties.....that have formed that kind of an alliance that feel that, you know, that they are not compatible with each other and want to break that alliance."

Ebbesen: "Well, ...can you give me an illustration that is taking place at the present time?"

Rigney: "I can give you one example that comes to mind..... namely, Boone County and Winnebago County have formed an alliance and apparently this is not working out and there's a desire to break that alliance."

Ebbesen: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Wikoff: "Harlan, what iswhat provision is made for any indebtedness that might be incurred by one of these counties....ah..."

Rigney: "There is no indebtedness to this office. We're not talking about the consolidation of schools, we're talking merely about the Educational Service Region. What we used to call the County Superintendents."

Wikoff: "Okay."

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

Lucco: "I rise in support....Pardon me. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. It really is just permissive and as Representative Rigney has stated, there could not be any indebtedness incurred. It has to do with the Regional Superintendents and Regional Counties and not with the school districts. I urge your support."

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

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I echo the comments of Representative Lucco. There is no debt involved in the



ESR regions. This merely gives people a way out. There is a way in. Currently the law, when people are dissatisfied, there is no way out of this existing set-up. I would urge an 'aye' vote on 490."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Ogle, Mr. Adams."

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. all those in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Mr. Rigney to close.er...Mr. Skinner to close. Who wants to close?... Mr. Rigney....Mr. Skinner."

Rigney: "I think the issue is very clear. Sometimes a bad marriage is made in these instances and it's just wise to dissolve that marriage and go somewhere else with it. We've just simply got to provide a means for two counties to separate when they are not compatible."

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 wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Well Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, since this problem does involve Winnebago County, I guess if Boone County doesn't want to receive the cultural benefits of Winnebago, I guess that's their right so I'm going to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 135 'ayes', 14 'nays, 4 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 493."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill"

Speaker Bradley: "I said 493...."

Clerk Hall: "House Bill 493, a Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Illinois Municipal Code, Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Antonovych."
 Antonovych.....Antonovych, turn him on, please.
 You are on, Sir."

Antonovych: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
 this is a merely Bill in that it merely authorizes
 municipalities to deal with the problem of juvenile
 delinquency by creating neighborhood accountability
 boards. However, for those communities that have a
 juvenile delinquency problem, this will provide a means
 to get federal and municipal moneys to provide staff and
 facilities for volunteers and this would allow the members
 of the community to participate in the process of law
 enforcement to relate to parents of the juvenile
 delinquents whichis a way to get at the root of
 the problem and also will provide an opportunity for
 the communities to give placement to juvenile delinquents
 to put them in socialwork and also to act as an
 agency that would take referrals from the courts and
 from the police departments in dealing with juveniles
 that havecaused particular problems in their com-
 munity. I urge your support of this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, Dan: "I have a question of the Sponsor, if he'll
 yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he'll yield, yes."

Houlihan, Dan: "What powers does this Bill grant municipalities
 that they don't have already?"

Antonovych: "That's why I explained this as a merely Bill. I
 think this it may be of significance to enact this
 and that there.....are several federal Bills that will
 provide up to three point one billion dollars which will
 specifically go to local agencies to help stimulate em-
 ployment in the youth labor market and I think it would
 be constructive to have this on the books and if any
 municipality wishes tocreate such a community



board it will be able to do so, but it may very well have that authority now."

Houlihan, Dan: "Well, that's what I'm getting at. It appears to me that any municipality already would have this authority and that the enabling legislation which is embodied in this Bill, is just simply unnecessary. Are you just trying to make here....some kind of a policy statement?"

Antonovych: "No. I would like to provide a vehicle for any money that come down in 1978....the federal Bill could have just specified ...and I would like them to ...would like communities to have an option to have such boards. I think ...but you are right, it would be an indication of policy to include communities in dealing with juvenile delinquency problems and to participate in our system of law enforcement ...which is not working out to our satisfaction....at this point."

Houlihan, Dan: "If I may speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

Houlihan, Dan: "I'm sure that it's the intent... The Sponsor of the Bill is very worthy....and that this is a laudable effort. But the fact is that an examination of the Statutes would indicate that the Bill is totally unnecessary. Home rule municipalities certainly don't need this. Non-home rule municipalities have this implicit in their general corporate powers. Much has been said here over the past several weeks about cluttering the Statutes with unnecessary statements. Particularly statements of policy, here. I ..don't think it's a good idea to do this to the Municipal Code. It is for that reason I would urge a negative vote for this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman to close the debate.....Mr. Antonovych. To close the debate, Sir."

Antonovych: "I urge a 'yes' vote on this Bill. As I explained it....it will not disrupt any present programs. It provides an additional vehicle to ...involve communities



which are faced with a problem and maybe dissatisfied with some of our government agencies and with the high crime rate. So I think an 'aye' vote would be welcome."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Sir, would you like to vote for your own Bill? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 133 'ayes', 18 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 543."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 543, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 543 is a response to a number of Illinois Supreme Court cases which misinterpreted the legislative intent in passing the Environmental Protection Act. When we passed that Act we never intended to take away any powers from local government. We intended only to give power to the state to deal with pollution problems throughout Illinois. The Supreme Court, however, said we intended to take away the local zoning power if it related to a property requiring the state permit like a landfill. House Bill 543 is carefully worded to do only one thing and one thing only.....to insure that the Environmental Protection Act is not interpreted to take away local power. The Bill does nothing more, it grants no power whatsoever to any local government that it does not otherwise have. Parenthetically, a sentence is added to confirm the result of a case which allowed a regional sewage treatment plant to be built despite local zoning problems. This is no change at all. If we sometime wish to take away local environmental power in some regard,



let us do so on purpose, looking at specific language, addressed to a specific problem....rather than have the Supreme Court makeup a fictitious legislative intent to so substantially effect local government. This is the same Bill word for word that passed out of the House in the last Session of the General Assembly. I would hope for a favorable Roll Call.....on House Bill 543."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, will this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Beatty, would you record me as voting 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 92 'ayes', 41 'nays', 14 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Billthe Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Speaker would reconsider his decision regarding letting us out of here so that we can get out in time to see the English version of a new show hosted by David Frost, called 'To Tell the Truth'."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bill 551."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 551....."

Speaker Bradley: "Take that out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. Five five four..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 554,"

Speaker Bradley: "Out of the record... House Bill 589."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 589, a Bill for an Act to repeal Sections of an Act in regard to evidence and dispositions, 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 Bill would reveal what's commonly known as the Deadman's Statute. The Deadman's Statute has been on the books for many years, it's archaic. The trend now is to consider the credibility of the



evidence rather than the admissibility. England abolished this Statute one hundred fifty years ago. I Sponsored an Amendment to it two years ago, which passed, to take away some of the provisions. I think it's an idea.....time has come....to repeal this, what now is a justice thwarting, rather than a justice producing Act. I would ask for the support of the House."

SPEAKER REDMOND IN CHAIR.....

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any questions? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative D. L. Houlihan, pardon me..."

Houlihan, D. L.: "I'd like to place a question to the Sponsor, if I may?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Houlihan, D. L.: "This would apparently be a rather major change in the law of evidence. Is that correct?"

Hart: "No, it wouldn't be a major change. As I said, I Sponsored legislation, actually it was a Senate Bill that I handled, in the House, in the last Session of the General Assembly, which took away some of theprovisions of the Deadman's Statute that had been in existence. This just would go all the rest of the way to repeal it. As I say, the trend in the law, in the United States is in this direction. This would let the jury weigh the credibility of the evidence rather than eliminate it or prohibit it on the basis ...that it is not admissible."

Houlihan, D. L.: "What is the attitude of the Illinois State Bar or the Chicago Bar Association with respect to the Bill?"

Hart: "I'm not aware that the Chicago Bar Association has taken a position on this Bill. The Illinois State Bar Association, which is a little bit defense dominated,I understand... opposes the Bill. As you recall, in a Judiciary Committee, we hadMorton John Barnard testified in favor of it, former President of the Illinois State Bar Association.



There are many...many lawyers that favor this idea. After I sponsored the Senate Bill two years ago, I received quite a bit of correspondence urging that we go all the way."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything....Representative Leinenweber.."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak in behalf of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Leinenweber: "I was on the Committee that heard the Bill. The object of a trial, whether it be criminal or civil, is to get at the truth....With the Deadman's Act, where one party to a transaction or an occurrence is dead, it seals the lips of the other party who may be the only witness to the actual event or deed which is sought to be proved or disproved during the course of a trial. In order towhen you seal the lips, then you have to rely solely on circumstantial evidence or indirect secondary evidence which puts the possibility of ascertaining the truth atat a second place behind a roadblock which I think has probably outlived its usefulness. All the Bill does now is that if one party to a transaction or a deed is dead, this Bill would permit the other party to testify. And the question for the trier of the facts, be there jury or a judge, would be to weigh the evidence insofar as..that the other party is dead, to see whether it is up to theit's up to the trier of the facts to weigh the evidence....bearing in mind that the deceased party can't contradict it. I think that the time has comein order to make a better attempt to ascertain what actually occurred or what is actually the truth.....an existing Act is a roadblock. So I would urge an 'aye' vote along with Representative Hart."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 106 'aye'; 13 'no'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Yourell."



Yourell: "I'd like to have leave to be recorded as 'aye' on 589."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has asked leave. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. Thought I better report where we are. We've been working since about twelve o'clock today. That's six hours and forty minutes. We have passed about thirty Bills. We have one hundred and fifty Bills on Third Reading. We have about seven hundred and fifty Bills on Second Reading. At this pace it's necessary that we remain in here tonight. The cafeteria is open. I can't guarantee what they are serving. If we don't do better tomorrow and Friday, the likelihood of staying here Saturday and possibly Sunday is very imminent. We are going to have every effort to have every Member to have a chance to have their Bill called. There just is no way that we can do it if we are going to take six hours and a half to take care of thirty Bills. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I certainly agree with what you've said, Mr. Speaker. The pace that we have here is certainly not going to be sufficient to get us out of here on time. We've done very well cooperating and trying to move these Bills but I think that most people in the chamber don't really realize the urgency that we have and the time schedule that we are up against. I would certainly support your position on that although I'm not too crazy about being here Saturday and Sunday. I think it's a thing we're going to have to do.....if everybody wants to have a fair hearing and have their Bill heard."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman, Gene: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't think there is any doubt but what we're going to have to do something to expedite. It seems to me that one of the things that would be most helpful is if we eliminated all explanations of voting. Now whether



we want to do that by rule...by amending the rule or if we want to do it ...by voluntarily doing what we think ought to be done. The fact of the matter isif you look over all of the Bills that are on this Calendar, there aren't very many of them that the people of the State of Illinois are going to be helped or hurt by.

Most of them aren't worth the paper they are printed on.

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do you arise."

Matijevich: "Point of order. We discuss this all of the time and it never works. I know he's got good intentions but it never works so he is out of order.....Let's go to the Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want to introduce to the new Members of the House the distinguished Member of this House, the now Senator Art Berman, on his forty-second birthday, is with us today. Happy Birthday, Art."

Speaker Redmond: "Six twenty four...."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 624, a Bill for an Act in relation to the protection of human rights of persons admitted to nursing homes, sheltered care homes and homes for the aged. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist...Oh!Pardon me. Five nine five.....Yours was such a tiny little Bill I didn't see it. "

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 595, a Bill for an Act in relation to alcoholic liquors, Third Reading of the Bill."

Sandquist: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Billwhat I think its time has come... All it does is to repeal the prohibition in the Liquor Control Act for the making of political contributions by liquor licensees. It's liquor licensees or any of their employees....it says you cannot make a contribution either directly or indirectly. It's been



in the Liquor Control Act since in the 1930's. I think, in our current status, when we have a financial...I mean disclosure laws on campaigns and when contributions have to be reported, there is no reason that liquor licensees should now be second-class citizens and cannot make contributions. I think it's something that we should do. We should clear up the law in this area and I ask a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Madison: "Representative Sandquist, recently the State Board of Elections, I understand, made a ruling that exempted the Cook County Democratic Party from reporting. Is that, in fact, the case?"

Sandquist: "I'm not....I've seen somein the paper about that but that really is beside the point on this."

Madison: "Well the point that I'm asking, Representative, isif that is in fact true? Then the reporting that you just mentioned would not bea person with a liquor license, if he made a contribution to the Cook County Democratic Party, would not be reported. Is that correct?"

Sandquist: "All I'm saying, ...if that is the case, then we should amend that law to make sure that all Committees are in. But to have corporations or individuals who are in one business.....they cannot make a contribution and another business they can, I think that that's wrong."

Madison: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 114 'aye'; and 18 'no'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Six twenty four."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 624...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kozubowski....Capparelli.... they both request unanimous consent. Is that correct? Leave is granted. Capparelli-Kozubowski will be recorded on five nine five. Six twenty four, Representative Byers."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 624, a Bill for an Act in relation to the protection of human rights of persons admitted to nursing homes, sheltered care homes and homes for the aged, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the third Bill in a series of the long-term Subcommittee reports on nursing homes. This will have to do with the patients bill of rights. It was approved in Committee. I ask a favorable Roll Call 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 wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 124 'aye' and 4 'no'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Six twenty four....."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 625, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Nursing Homes and Homes for the Aged Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the fourth Bill in a series....House Bill 625. This sets up a procedure for hearings and I would move for the adoption of this Bill, House Bill 625."

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

Pullen: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."



Pullen: "You said that this Bill sets up a procedure for hearings. Does this Bill also set up an evaluation rating of the nursing homes that would be kept in a file in the Department of Public Health?"

Byers: "Yes, Ma'am."

Pullen: "Would that file be open for public inspection?"

Byers: "Yes, Ma'am."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 114 'aye' and 16 'no'; and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Six twenty seven."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 627, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Nursing Homes, Sheltered Care Homes and Homes for the Aged Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the last Bill in the series, House Bill 627. This sets up all the new nursing homes that are built after 1978, that fire sprinklers, smoke detectors, et cetera, shall be installed in those. I think Representative Geo-Karis wanted to speak on this Bill also."

Speaker Redmond: "No she didn't. Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', Representative Totten. The Gentleman standing between Representative Totten and the Chair, sit down. Sit down!"

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I note, on the Calendar, that a fiscal note has been filed on this. Would the Sponsor care to indicate what the fiscal note says."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Yes, Sir. The Department of Public Health said it would have no impact whatsoever upon it."

Totten: "I don't believe it."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

McClain: "Mr. Byers, would extreme hardship also be where a municipality or a township or unincorporated area did not have the water pressure, would not require that nursing care home or sheltered care home to have a sprinkler system?"

Byers: "Yes, this came up in hearings and this would be taken into consideration. This was brought out in fact in..."

McClain: "That would be defined as an extreme hardship?"

Byers: "Yes."

McClain: "Thank you."

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

Kempiners: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Byers: "Yes, Sir."

Kempiners: "It's my understanding that this Bill would prohibit the Department of Public Health from automatically waiving the requirement for the installation of fire sprinklers in a building. Is that correct?"

Byers: "Yes, Sir."

Kempiners: "I'd like to address this Bill, Mr. Speaker and speak in opposition to it. I think that if anything has been brought to our attention in this Legislature, it's the fact that the Legislature is mandating requirements on these homes that are uping their costs and not necessarily achieving the purpose for which we are intending them. We, in return, are not reimbursing them for these costs through our Medicaid payments, for example. It's been pointed out, in the previous Session, when we had similar legislation, that the deaths resulting from fires in nursing homes are not from the fires themselves but



from smoke inhalation. I feel that there are some institutions which could be constructed with smoke detectors in them that are a lot less costly than are the automatic fire sprinklers; and I think in the long run you're just adding to the cost of these homes without upgrading the quality of care. I would be opposed to this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "I have a question for the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker.....Does this Bill mandate the automatic sprinklers in the patient's rooms as well as in the common areas and store rooms and this kind of thing?"

Byers: "Representative Dunn, for the new construction of nursing homes, it does."

Dunn: "I've heard considerable discussion that can make the merits of that practice questionable and I would like to follow up on the previous speaker and question why there isn't a provision in here for smoke detectors and second.."

Byers: "It's in the Bill, Sir... Smoke detectors also..."

Dunn: "It doesn't really refer to them in the Digest..ah..ah.."

Byers: "No. It's in the Bill."

Dunn: "Smoke detectors or sprinklers.."

Byers: "Yes, Sir."

Dunn: "And would you..."

Unknown: "Not 'or'.....'and'...."

Byers: "Just a minute while we read the Bill. Not 'and'; 'or'."

Dunn: "...And ...would you explain House Amendment #2, as shown in the Digest?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Dunn: "No....wait a minute. Pardon me. I'm looking at the wrong page."

Byers: "I thought there wasn't any any Amendments to it."

Dunn: "Thank you."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I never interrupt a Bill while it's



in progress butYou know, a little while ago, it was said from the Podium that we're going to work until eight o'clock. Some of us have taken that at its word and we haven't gotten anything to eat. You've always been good in the past in letting us take a break. Since that policy, nobody has keeled over in this house, because of that policy. At eight o'clock I'm going to move to adjourn because it was said from the podium, 'we are going to get out of here at eight o'clock. I really.... I've been here all day and I think the House has worked real good all day. They worked real hard and I think they have deliberated and done it in a deliberative fashion. I think that's the way we should operate. I think that the word from the podium ought to be kept and at eight o'clock I want to be recognized for a motion to adjourn."

Speaker Redmond: "It's perfectly all right with the Chair, Representative Matijevich, but I didn't make any promise about Saturday and Sunday. Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Representative Byers, as I understand the discussion of this Bill, your Bill would mandate automatic fire sprinklers.....ah...sprinkler systems in any new nursing homes. Did I understand that it also mandates smoke detector systems?"

Byers: "What it is, Representative Schuneman, the twenty-third edition of the Life Safety Code, says that in this, that thesemay include, separately or in combination, such fire protection devices or systems as smoke detection systems as well as or sprinkler systems. It can be either/or to conform with the life safety system."

Schuneman: "Are you saying then that it does not mandate sprinkler systems?"

Byers: "What this Bill does ...to comply with the..."

Schuneman: "...Can't you answer that question, Representative?"



Byers: "No.....The answer to your question is 'no'. I mean, I can answer your question and the answer is 'no'."

Schuneman: "The Bill does not mandate automatic sprinkler systems?"

Byers: "No, but what it does it mandates that it follow the Life Safety Code which does setup those requirements in there."

Schuneman: "Okay. So the practical effect of the Bill is that we are mandating automatic sprinkler systems in nursing homes?"

Byers: "In new homes only."

Schuneman: "Right. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address myself to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schuneman: "I think Representative Kempiners earlier made a very important point relative to this Bill. The loss of life in nursing homes, generally, is because of smoke inhalation. The installation of proper smoke detectors will go much farther than will the installation of automaticwater sprinklers. I think also that many of us may find that some of our communities may not have the nursing homes that we'd like to have in them if this Bill passes. Because the cost of the installation of water sprinklers is a very major significant cost in a nursing home. I would urge that this Bill be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I had House Bill 606 which had.....would have been a Bill for smoke detectors, but as long as this Bill is on the books I put mine on Interim Study Committee. I'd like to speak in favor of this Bill. This Bill is a good Bill because it provides for a sprinkling system..... sprinkler systems in the new constructions. We cannot ignore the loss of life in a nursing home any more. We lost two people in a Zion nursing home and we did have a smoke detector system. I certainly would urge everyone



to support this Bill because we cannot turn away from the necessity of proper protection for people who are helpless."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill. I think that any Bill that mandates automatic sprinkler systems in new constructions is reasonable and should be supported. If I am not in error they are already mandated in Chicago and Cook County. This is something we should have. The point was made that death comes from smoke inhalation but remember there is no smoke inhalation death unless there is fire. It is the fire that generates the smoke that kills people. Smoke detectors are well and good but there won't be that smoke killing people if that automatic sprinkling system is touched off and puts out that small blaze before it generates enough smoke to kill people. I think ...the sprinkling system is the one single best aid and deterrent to the loss of life in fires everywhere and particularly in nursing homes where people are least able to take care of themselves. If they want to put in smoke detectors in addition I think that's well and good and laudable but I do think the sprinkler system is the necessity that we must mandate in new constructions. This is not saying put it in old buildings. I had a Bill last year that said put it in all nursing homes. I was defeated on the basis of cost....although I still disagree with that. But to say that you don't need it in new construction ...I think is pound wise and penny foolish and I urge the support of this very good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put. All in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it; Representative Byers to close."



Byers: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In the report of the fire in a Chicago nursing home where there were...thirty-one persons were killed, the report definitely stated that an automatic sprinkler system, according to the investigators, would have saved lives. Now...I think this is a minimum requirement to expect in new nursing homes built in the State of Illinois. We're spending currently, in the State of Illinois, two hundred and thirty million dollars a year for some forty-nine thousand people. I don't think there is anyone who feels that's too much of a requirement to ask for nursing homes ... for them to install ...in new nursing homes, a fire sprinkling system and a fire...smoke detecting system.

I would urge a favorable consideration for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 96 'aye' and 39 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Six four six..... Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I realize this is not the proper time to enter into any debate, but I did want the Chair to be aware of the fact that many of us realize that conditions do change and some of us have already taken the opportunity to send out for dinners. So I just wanted my colleagues across the aisle to know that when eight o'clock comes there probably will be many of us who might be opposed to his motion. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Six forty six."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 646, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to return this to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."



Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave to take it back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Six forty-six, to the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Kempiners, amends House Bill 646, as amended, in the title of the Bill and so forth."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Amendment that I offered in Committee did much more than I had intended for it to do. One of the purposes of the Bill is to require that election authorities and Post Offices are notified when there is an annexation, disconnection and annexation or disconnection. This Amendment will require that to occur within thirty days. However, it does not put back into the Bill that portion which was objected to by the Municipal League and I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

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

Houlihan, D. L.: "What was the Section that was objected by the Municipal League?"

Kempiners: "I had a clause in there that would have voided the action of the municipality....this was not accomplished. That is the portion that I'm not putting in with this Amendment. They still would have to report but there would be no voiding of the action."

Houlihan, D. L.: "Do you put annexation back into the Bill?"

Kempiners: "Annexation, disconnection and annexation or disconnection under this Article and I did check with the Municipal League and they had no objection to my doing this. I talked to Tom Fitzsimmons."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. Anything further, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Six forty-one. Representative Dunn, are you ready to go with that one? Six four one."



Do you desire to return that....."

Dunn, R.: "I'd like to return it to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment..."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objection,returned to the order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Amendment."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Ralph Dunn, amends House Bill 641, on page one, line fourteen and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn, Ralph Dunn."

Dunn, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #1, I agreed in Committee to offer as an Amendment on the floor and I would urge its adoption. It says that you can....municipalities can, by city ordinance as a Bill, permit people to sell puppies or offer other contributions within a city limits. My Amendment says 'Only at a stop sign or at a traffic control signal'. I'd urge the adoption of Amendment #1."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Six four seven. Representative Kempiners, do you want that called? Six four seven."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 647, a Bill for an Act in relation to merit systems for Sheriff's personnel, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is very similar to House Bill 1029 and 3814 of the 79th General Assembly. Basically what it does is combine the Counties Act and the County Police Department Act and takes the opinions which have been rendered by the Attorney General with regard to Sheriff's merit



systems and combines them into one Act. We worked with the Illinois Sheriff's Association and the Illinois Association of County Sheriffs. They are both supporting it. We had input from the Urban County Council and the Paternal Order of Police and to my knowledge there is no one who is objecting to this, no organization which is objecting to this Act and I would ask for your favorable support..."

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

Houlihan, D. L.: "Is Cook County affected by the Bill?"

Kempiners: "Not at all. Cook County has its own Act."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco."

Lucco: ".....Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill passed out of our Committee on County and Townships sixteen to nothing. I solicit your support of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further. The question is on theshall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 146 'aye' and no 'nay'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Six fifty one. Representative Beatty."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 651, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Workmen's Compensation Act,....."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. Six six nine."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 669, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to Civil Rights Division in the Office of the Attorney General, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the final Bill in a series of Bills regarding sex discrimination on the Statutes of the State of Illinois."



House Bill 669 merely inserts sex and national origin to the list of discriminatory Acts that the Civil Rights Division of the Attorney General's Office is to investigate and prosecute. This simply adds sex and national origin to a Department that is already set up to handle this. It came out of Committee twenty to nothing and I would urge your support of House Bill 669."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Six seven five. Representative Steele."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 675, a Bill for an Act relating to fire protection districts, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steele."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 675 as amended changes by a nickel, or by five cents, the maximum amount that a fire district can levy for ambulance service. It was passed in Committee by a vote of seventeen to nothing. It includes the same referendum provisions as in existing law. I would urge your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions. Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 107 'aye', and 7 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Six seven seven. Representative Skinner. Read the Bill..."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 677, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."



Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly, we've all had people come to us who have had trouble with the state bureaucracy. This is how this Bill started. It will cost approximately fifteen thousand dollars, we think. Because only five to ten children will be eligible under the change that will be made. At the present time, the Office of Education is allowed to reimburse out of state private school facilities for special education when the local school district says that's the best way to go. But they are not allowed to reimburse public schools that are outside of the state. I have a constituent in my district who has come to me afterafter beating her head....her and his head... the man and the wife, ...against the Office of Education stone wall for about six months. It seems that this is what has to be done to solve their problem. I would respectfully ask your support of House Bill 677."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Skinner: "Certainly."

McClain: "Mr. Skinner, could you tell me, with our programs that...especially the new Federal Act, which mandates that we have to take care of all kids that have handicapped problems. What kind of situation are we causing ourselves. Can we turn down parents that want to send their child to an out of state facility?"

Skinner: "If you mean by 'we'....Can the local school board? The answer is 'yes'."

McClain: "How about if the local school board did not offer the kind of program that the handicapped parents desire? Can the school board still turn that child down?"

Skinner: "I also happen to have a constituent that is in a situation like that. That individual can then appeal to the Office of Education. In this case....that is to over-



turn the local school board's decision. In this case the local school board concurs with the parents that they do not have an acceptable program. They are willing to have their special education dollars sent to this public school in the Minneapolis area, the Hamer School, but the Office of Education says 'no'."

McClain: "How do you rectify that? The Handicapped Act 94142, by Congress, claims that all residents of the state ought to be provided handicapped education...period. Aren't we really proliferating that and meaning that maybe all residents don't have to be provided handicapped education and stimulating out of state schools."

Skinner: "Representative, I'm afraid you are over my head when you are going and citing the Federal Law in a simple case in the State of Illinois. I believe that ...I know that this law requires that the school board in question determines itself that the public special ed facilities that are offered at the local school are not as good as at this private school out of state...and for that reason I just cannot see the size of the loophole that your question seems to be inferring ...would occur... or implying would occur."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if I may speak to this Bill? I will say that this Bill had a very full hearing in the Education Committee and I think that the application for coverage under this Bill would be very slight. This Bill would apply to a child who is in a residential situation out of state but where the public school in that area, where the residence is, has a program suitable for that child. It really seems to me that it follows along very well with the intent, as I understand it, of the federal legislation which is to try to provide the best education possible for a handicapped child. Only a very...very few children would qualify for this



kind of aid but it certainly seems justified that they should qualify for receiving it and I urge your support of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, as the Sponsor of House Bill 2671, which first created the Section of the Statute, where tuition for handicapped children.....because of the nature of their handicap, must attend a nonpublic school....which that was provided. We covered both in state and out of state nonpublic schools. I can see nothing wrong with this Bill. If a child is in a out of state residential facility, and for some reason in that state, a public school was provided for that child's educational portion, then there should be reimbursement to the extend authorized by the Statute. It's an extension that won't take place in too many cases, I don't know about Representative Skinner's case, but I'm surprised that tuition would be charged by the public school out of state but perhaps because the student is from Illinois they might charge it. The Bill still requires the approval of the local school district and the State Board of....the State Board of Education....or rather the Office of Education. I think the Bill is a logical extension of the original House Bill 2671....and will support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes, I'm going to support this Bill but I'm going to allow Representative Skinner to explain how the state is going to reimburse the local school districts for this expenditure. Yesterday, House Bill 1211 was up, which was to reimburse school districts for expenditures similar to this and I noticed his vote was a negative vote. Now this is a kind of program those of you who want to be honest with your constituents ought to take a look at. Either you're for the program, therefore, you will vote for the appropriation measure that has to take place in a



supplemental measurement because we do not know the cost, totally, until after the school board expends the money and sends in the Bill to the Office of Education a year later and then we come up and we say 'No, we're not going to pay the Bill.' That's what happened here yesterday on the floor of this House with the identical provision of what this Bill here called for...I'm going to vote for this but I hope that everyone of you that do vote for itremember this when the supplemental Bill is up.....and vote for that also."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Waddell."

Weddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this because I think it is vital. The only thing that I would like to see to it would be the fact that when it got to the Senate I would like to have you Amend it to include parochial....we do have some very specialized facilities in other states that we do not have here that happen to be parochial. I urge your support of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I thank and....I thank all of the people that spoke on this Bill. All of whom know more about special education than I do. I accept my colleague's chidings although I would point out that the Peterson family would be quite willing to accept whatever money the General Assembly gives. They are now about three years in the rears.....because of the Office of Education's stonewalling this."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all



voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'aye' and 11 'no'.....And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Six eighty-four."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 684, a Bill for an Act to create a statewide educational data network to serve the electronic data processing needs of local public school districts and Educational Service Regions. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, This is a Bill requested by the Office of Education. It's a permissive piece of legislation that would make it possible for local school districts to connect in with the Department of Finance computers. Many of our school districts are already spending quite a bit of money on computer services. This would allow them to come into a centralized system if they so chose and would give them a great deal of economy in plugging into systems that would be designed specifically for school districts. I don't believe there is any controversy on the Bill and I would urge your support."

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

Martin, L.: "Just ask the Representative, does this appear in the budget, because of the increased cost that might result?"

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

Martin, L.: "Without speaking to the merits of the program, doesdo the costs that could accrue in such a program appear in IOE's budget?"

Satterthwaite: "Yes."

Martin, L.: "Do they appear in the Governor's budget?"



Satterthwaite: "I cannot tell you that, but I would assume that however that is handled it will be ironed out in the Appropriations Committee hearing on the IOE budget."

Martin, L.: "Well, I think it probably is important to know... if it appears in the Governor's Budget."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote; earlier we passed down Representative Von Boeckman's program and Representative Lynn Martin's in regard to mandating programs. All the programs start off to be permissive kind of programs and everyone of us is going to have to make up our individual minds whether we're going to support this or not. Let me just indicate, for your consideration, that in FY-78 ...one hundred school districts participate in this program...it's going to cost the state two hundred and forty thousand dollars and two million two hundred thousand dollars to the local school districts. And in the contemplated plan, by FY-82..should all the schools be involved in this program, the cost to the state will be an estimated one million two hundred thousand but an additional sixteen million five hundred thousand dollars from the local schools. I give those figures to you for your consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me point out that it is in the IOE budget....it is very much a part of it.... The gist of the legislation is that everyone will be able to plug into this computer and utilize that for the various school districts. It's estimated by those school districts referred to by Representative Peters that they are saving over a million dollars beyond what they are expending at this time. This merely lets all the rest of the school districts in the state have the opportunity to use that computer if they so desire. I certainly urge your support."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman, do you still seek recognition? Have all voted who wish? Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I's just like to call the attention to Members of the House....to something that you talked about earlier and that is pushing some switches for other Members. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, if we get on some of these close votes ...we're going to trigger off a verification of Roll Call. I would suggest that before you take the record ...if anybody has pushed the switch of people who aren't here, maybe in the interest of time they could turn it off."

Speaker Redmond: "I see what you're talking about. Let's dump this Roll Call and we'll have another one. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote and in allowing those who thought they had already voted in favor of this Billto get back to their switches, may I emphasize that this is purely permissive. No school district need come under this Bill unless they see it as a money saving device. Many of them do find that this would be a much more economical system for them than they are currently expending for their data processing ...right now. It also would allow for them to come under a system where they could exchange information. They can provide information to the Illinois Office of Education and I think in the long run you will find that any school participating will save far more by it than they are expending. It will also mean that as I say, the Illinois Office of Education can have some economy in their operation."

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

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to verify this at the



proper time."

Speaker Redmond: "We're going to dump thisAgain I see at least three Members who are not here who are voted. I can't encourage you too muchDo not vote anybody's switch but your own...on this kind of a measure. Dump the Roll Call. The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. I am getting up now to explain my vote only because I didn't take the opportunity on the last few Roll Calls. I thought the votes were there to put this measure on and I don't know that we need any further explanation. I just wish we had the same votes. This is a good Bill to increase the capacity of people to enter into a data information system that would be statewide. I think in the future it will benefit all educational districts in the state and I urge everybody to support this legislation. It will not come down as a great cost item in this next year. It will take some schools some years to get on it but as they realize how much it can help them it will only save money for the schools that participate and in the long run provide a more efficient system for all of us in the state and I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, in explaining my vote, I would urge an 'aye' vote and hope that those who did vote on the previous Roll Call.....then ...this Bill would have a chance to get back and vote again....as well as those who were taken off because they weren't here."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Satterthwaite, do you want to explain your vote?"



Satterthwaite: "No, Mr. Speaker, I would just ask for a poll of the absentees, if we need it."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Lady has requested a poll of the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych, Bluthardt..."

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

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, I would waive the polling of the absentees if there is not going to be a verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I'd like to verify, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Don Brummet, Domico, Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Epton, Friedrich, Griesheimer, Harris, Hart, Dave Jones, Emil Jones, Klosak, Kornowicz, Kucharski, Madison, Peggy Smith Martin, McAuliffe, Meyer, Mulcahey, O'Brien.."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Schoeberlein, ..."

Speaker Redmond: "I hear somebody but I don't see them. Representative Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my vote from 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'no'. Proceed with the .."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schoeberlein, Stearney, Tuerk, Wikoff, ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien.....'aye'..."

Clerk O'Brien: "...and Winchester.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton, did you seek recognition? Record the Gentleman as 'no'. Representative Johnson..."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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



Johnson: "Change my vote to 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'present'."

Proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll
Call. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Could I have the count, please?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Ninety-two 'aye'....there were two added....
and two went off. Fifty-three 'nays'."

Ryan: "Ninety-two to fifty-three, is that the count?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Right."

Speaker Redmond: "Right."

Clerk O'Brien: "And eight 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson, E. M. Barnes, Beatty, Birchler,
Bowman, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer,
Byers, Caldwell, Capparelli, Catania, Chapman,
Christiansen, Corneal Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Doyle,
John Dunn, Ebbesen, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Garmisa,
Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Hanahan, Holewinski
Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Kane,
Katz, Kelly, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Laurino, Lechowicz,
Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Mann, Marovitz,
Matejek, Matijevich, Mautino, McAvoy, McClain, McGrew,..."

Speaker Redmond: "Who is seeking recognition? Is it....
McAvoy? How is he recorded?"

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

McAvoy: "Change it to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change it to 'no'. Representative Wall..."

Wall: "Change mine to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'no'.
Representative Dawson, for what purpose do you arise?...
Representative Houlihan....for what purpose do you arise?"

Houlihan: "May I be verified at this time?"

Speaker Redmond: "May the Gentleman be verified at this time?
Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "McClain, McGrew, McLendon, McPike, Mudd, Mugalian,
Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, O'Brien, O'Daniel, Pechous,



Pierce, Pouncey, Richmond, Robinson, Satterthwaite,
Schisler, Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert, Skinner, Stanley.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "I'd like to change my vote from 'aye' to 'present',
please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'present'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Terzich, Tipsword,
Van Duynes, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Willer, Williams,
Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Any questions Mr. Ryan?"

Ryan: "...What's the count now, Mr. Speaker?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Eighty-nine 'aye'.....65 'nay'....."

Ryan: "Brandt?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's there."

Ryan: "Breslin?"

Speaker Redmond: "She's here."

Ryan: "Done a nice job getting everybody in. Christensen?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Ryan: "Corneal Davis?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. He is in his seat."

Ryan: "John Dunn?"

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

Ryan: "Ebbesen?"

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

Ryan: "Garmisa?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Ryan: "Giglio?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Ryan: "Which Houlihan did we verify? Dan? Jim?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Ryan: "Huff?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff? He's in the back."

Ryan: "Kozubowski?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Ryan: "Laurino?"



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino? How is he recorded."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ryan: "Leverenz?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz. He's back there in his seat."

Ryan: "Representative Mann?"

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Ryan: "Mann. Representative Mann? How is he recorded?"

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

Unknown: "He's here, Mr. Speaker. I see him over there."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think he is in his right seat though. He's in O'Brien's seat."

Ryan: "McLendon?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McLendon. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ryan: "Pouncey?"

Speaker Redmond: "Taylor Pouncey, is he back there? I think so. There he is."

Ryan: "I don't know how we could miss him? Sharp?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sharp is in his seat."

Ryan: "Schumpert?"

Speaker Redmond: "Schumpert?...One's bigger than the other back there."

Ryan: "Steczo."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steczo? How is Representative Steczo....He's in the back...."

Ryan: "Negotiating a seat on this side, Mr. Speaker. Representative Yourell, I see, is here. Is Representative Skinner?"

Speaker Redmond: "Who? Skinner's here."

Ryan: "Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here someplace. Representative O'Brien? Representative O'Brien here?"

Ryan: "No, he's not here."



Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Ryan: "Representative Capparelli?"

Speaker Redmond: "Capparelli is here."

Ryan: "I've already called Giglio. I have no further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the score, Mr. Clerk? Representative Satterthwaite?"

Satterthwaite: "I'll abide by the Clerk's count but I believe we're below 89 and in that case I'd like to have it put on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. I'd just like to call your attention to the fact that those removed, it was obvious from the Chair that they weren't here. So whoever moved their switches just wasted fifteen minutes...."

Satterthwaite: "No, O'Brien...had..."

Speaker Redmond: "Six ninety one...."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 691, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is the Bill that we started on momentarily last night. I was asked to take it out of the record by Representative Lechowicz and I have since talked to him and he has removed any objection to it. What it does is allow school districts to use their levy for fire prevention...actually it's their levy for fire safety standards, to use that money for energy conservation matters...as soon as they have met the fire safety standards. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as the Sponsor mentioned a moment ago, this Bill does extend



the life safety code legislation. It was originally enacted in 1961 because of a disastrous Chicago school fire. That legislation gave school districts a five cent tax levy authorization without referendum for quote, 'Fire prevention and safety purposes'. This taxing authority is contained in Section 17 of the School Code. However, even though the Section dealing with the taxing authority is explicit, the school boards have relied on language in Section 2-3 of the School Code to use this taxing authority for any and all reasons that quote, 'Improve standards of safety and health of pupils'. To bring to your attention some of the abuses of this Life Safety Code, I asked the Office of Education to review their files for three school districts in or adjacent to my legislative district. Let me share with you some of the abuses that the school districts are now making of this Life Safety Code. In Evanston, for example, thirty-eight thousand dollars was....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Point of order. The Gentleman and I have discussed this. He is not addressing himself to the Bill whatsoever. He's addressing himself to a problem of policing that existing tax in a couple of districts in his area. I recognize thathave no problem with it, but he's not speaking to the Bill."

McCourt: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is one Section of the Code that has been abused. I think before we expand this taxation, this authorization without a referendum, that we should see what has happened and how these school districts are using it and I would ask a 'no' vote for this legislation."

Unknown: "Let it go. Come on guys..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

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



Six ninety-one is a Bill that ought to be considered on its own merits. I think it has considerable merits that deal with a problem that we've just recently found to be difficult in the last five years or so. Representative McCourt's remarks are well taken, they don't relate, necessarily, to his Bill. He has a Bill which I think we can consider and which I also will support, that deals much more precisely with solving this problem. It should not be considered in tandem with 691. They deal with two different things and Representative McCourt's Bill solves his problem and 691 solves McGrew's problem. They're both good Bills. They're not incompatible. I would suggest an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats. Keats."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Keats: "Representative McGrew, now...this is in a sense a tax increase. Is there any referendum...front door or back door on this?"

McGrew: "There is no increase whatsoever in House Bill 691."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Keats: "If you are giving additional jurisdiction to a present tax, that is a tax increase regardless of how we want to say it, you can now spend it on more things than you used to in the past. So what you're doing is expanding something that was made entirely due to a life safety thing, abuse or not, it was meant for life safety. Now we are expanding a nonreferendum...tax ...and let me remind you of one thing...nonreferendum tax is an area that has nothing to do with life safety. So I just want to say, vote on the merits...but it's a nonreferendum tax being put into areas that are totally unrelated to life safety which is the reason this Bill was passed almost unanimously fifteen years ago. Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Members, this Bill is in no way incompatible with the provisions of the Bill that Representative McCourt spoke to, which she has. It should be considered on its own merits and we ought to also consider the fact that the tax which is already levied in the districts to which this Bill would speak, would also have the beneficial impact of conserving energy, which is a most important concern in this time and in this day. I would urge a 'yes' vote on 691 because of that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move the previous question."

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

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I submit to you that perhaps Representative Keats has his children confused. I think he gave one a nickel and told him he could buy some bubble gum and he said, 'no, I wanted lollipops'... and he said, 'that's a dime, Dad'. I submit to you they now have the taxing authority. We are not increasing that taxing authority one iota. It's a good Bill and I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

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

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, looking at the voting board, I may be stuffing a finger in the dike when it's much too late. But let me point out to the Members of this House that just because the tax is already being assessed is no reason to authorize its continuation. I strongly believe that the people of this state might better be served by allowing some tax money to stay in



their own pockets, for them to decide how to dispense rather than to put it into units of government whether it be state or local. This is a rip-off, Mr. Speaker. We have absolutely gone energy saving nuts. It's wild that reasonable people in this General Assembly can be stampeded by the scare tactics that are proposed by this Bill. It's absolutely abominable that someone would put in a Bill that would continue attacks, whose time and purpose has long since gone. It's simply a rip-off of the public. We have a means of gaining more money and we will figure out a way to spend it. It is the Parkinson Principle in excelsus. Mr. Speaker, I strongly recommend that the House is making a very serious mistake in the vote that is on the board at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'aye' and 36 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Seven zero one... out of the record, at the request of the Sponsor. Seven zero two, Representative Flinn."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 702, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 702 addresses itself to a longstanding problem. One that was created by the 1970 Constitution which prevented the counties from charging the various districts for collecting and extending taxes. Now...we have tried several times to correct this problem and each time the Supreme Court has struck down the law that we passed. This one, we think, is one that will get by the Supreme Court. It is one that is supported by the Urban Counties Council and it is one that is also supported by the Illinois Taxpayer's Association, Maurice Scott. It was.....I can't recall the vote in Committee but I think we had one opposing vote in the



Committeeand with a large majority. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Dan Houlihan. Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, Dan: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor whether or not this Bill has any affect on Cook County?"

Flinn: "No. It does not. Cook County is excluded because it's counties under one million."

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

Martin: "Yes, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers, I can't see Representative Martin."

Martin, L.: "....explain my vote. This....As you know, counties collect taxes for the school districts for the cities for everyone. The costs are becoming increasingly grave to county government. I'd ask your support ofyour support for this measure because I think it helps all districts within the area. This does not affect Chicago but for urban and rural counties this is a real boon and it does not effect the other taxing districts within it. It is a good Bill and deserves your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me point out that over the period since we passed the 1970 Constitution....we have made several efforts to do something about the county's loss of the cost of collecting taxes, but at all times those were at the expense of other taxing bodies. This Bill is not at the expense of any other taxing body. It would be a different tax. It would be permissible by the county boards. It does not require them to put it on. It is merely permissive. Again, let me say, as the Sponsor said earlier, this was



one of the Bills, the only Bill, in regard to the cost of collection and county government that Maurice Scott, of the Taxpayer's Federation did say that he would support. This is the one and only Bill. I think certainly the respect that all of us in this legislative chamber have for Maurice Scott should encourage us to vote 'yes' on this legislation. I would encourage your support."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To explain my vote, I just remind the Members that this is the imposition of a new tax without referendum."

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

Yourell: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is one of two Bills that we considered in Counties and Townships and my Bill, House Bill 442 was not passed and the reason for that was that I thought this was a better Bill. This is permissive legislation and again, if units of local government and officials elected to those units want to go on the hook, to their voters ...their constituents, to place an additional tax on them, this is the way it ought to be done. If it was mandatory then I would suggest that a referendum would be in order but this is permissive. They are taking their chances with their constituents. If they want to go that route I think we ought to give them the opportunity.....because this is a responsible action by those county board members who want to do something and this is the way they ought to do it. I suggest that we get a few more green lights up there to let them do what they want to do locally."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: " Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my 'no' vote



I might say...if there is any county that is hard pressed for funds, it is my own county of DuPage. They would perhaps welcome this, I'm not sure. I haven't heard from my county in regard to this but I am sure of one thing; that if I go back to my district and I tell my constituents that I have come down here and supported an additional and new tax, or even made such a thing possible that could be slipped over on them without their having a chance to say, through referendum, whether they approve it or not, I am sure that this would meet with the disapproval of my constituents. This is a tax added on other taxes to make the collection of taxes possible. I would suggest that it's enough to tax the patients of the people at least...in my district. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn to explain his vote."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady...Representative Levin, please...."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know how anything can be so misunderstood as this has been. This is not a tax increase. What it does.....it offers to the county boards the opportunityif they so desire to propose an additional tax upon their county and their people for the extending and the collecting of taxes. We have tried and tried on several occasions, since the 1970 Constitution, to correct the inequity to the counties.... which previously were permitted to take a part of the school taxes, a part of the other taxes, a percent of them and was outlawed under the Constitution. Now, what's happening here is, we're putting the onus on the right people, the county board. They do not have to pass the tax if they don't want it. Now if Representative Hudson's county is hard pressed and his county board don't want to pass they don't have to. This doesn't



command them to do anything. But there are a lot of counties who are willing and are hamstrung by the Legislature. They are held down and are told that they have got to live within their means and there is no means."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know whether I need to make the comment now but if we're going to end up in a verification I would hope that we would stay in the same posture that we have stayed before and people only vote their own switches so that we don't have to go through what we went through the last time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is strictly on verification. Representative Hoffman has already said it. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 86 'aye' and 60 'no'.....Representative Monroe Flinn."

Flinn: "I would like to have permission to place this on Postponed Consideration.....until we can erase some of the misunderstanding about it."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. Seven zero..... Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, a little while ago I did say that at eight o'clock I was going to move to adjourn....and Representative...Well, I'm going by Roman Kosinski's watch. He's the jeweler.... and he told me what time it was. He said that clock is wrong. And....and I heard Representative Epton mention that some had gone out to lunch and therefore we should change plans. Almost one third of the Members of the House have been here since eight o'clock, not since noon. They've been in Appropriations Committee. There was a select committee on governmental reorganization. We've been here a long time. So my conscience tells me, and I



remember last Session, when I was concerned about Representative Epton's health. My conscience tells me that this is a better route to go. I remember one Session whenin a two year span...we lost eleven Members. I'm going to stand with this motion to adjourn until 9 a.m. tomorrow."

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

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to go along with the wishes ofyour wishes and those of the Chair and if it is your desire toto adjourn I willcertainly go along with it. But if it is not why we'll do our best to hold your position."

Speaker Redmond: "Well,my wish is whatever the majority of the Members out there decide. My better judgment says we should not, however. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker. I don't mind staying later tonight I don't mind coming here on the weekends. But as long as everybody gets a chance to have their Bill called but what I don't like to see is a member ask to have his Bill passed over because for some reason unknown to the Assembly he doesn't want it called at that particular time. That's what I consider game playing and I don't like to be here after eight o'clock at night. I don't like to be here on weekends just so some Members can resort to game playing and hope that through some passage of time they have a better chance to pass their Bill. I wish the Chair would make it clear to the Members that they'll have one chance to have their Bill called and unless they have an excellent reason ...to take it out of the record. If that would be the Chair's intention I would certainly be willing to do anything the Chair desires."

Speaker Redmond: "My intention is to be bound by the rules.... whatever they are. It seems to me the rule said a Member



can take hisrequest that his Bill be taken out of the record and go to a Roll Call and then it has to go on Postponed Consideration. My preference would be that once we put it in the record it would have to go on Postponed Consideration and get one other crack at it but that's not the rule. Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to point out that that motion is nondebatable."

Speaker Redmond: "Correct. The question is on Representative Matijevich's motion that the House do now adjourn until nine o'clock tomorrow morning. Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'.Requires a simple majority. Incidentally if we do adjourn now we will go to the order of Second Reading tomorrow and we won'ttomorrow and Friday and we won't return to Third Reading until next week. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 80 'aye' and 74 'no'.....and the Gentleman's motion carries. Mr. Clerk, what are your requirements?"

Clerk O'Brien: "We haven't done Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second Day...today and I need about three minutes Perfunctory."

Speaker Redmond: "...We stand in Perfunctory Session for three minutes and then adjourn until tomorrow morning at nine. Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan, James: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to have the Attendance Roll Call for my Bill which was up next? It's noncontroversial. Passed out thirteen to nothing."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there leave? I think we've adjourned, haven't we, James?"

Unknown: "I think so."

Speaker Redmond: "We're in Perfunctory Session now. We'll take you the first thing in the morning."

Houlihan, James: "Could I have leave for Perfunctory Session?"

Speaker Redmond: "We don't have any attendance on that now."



We'll take that in the morning. Mr. Clerk, proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2387, Garmisa, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriationthe Illinois Transportation Study Commission, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2388, J. David Jones, a Bill for an Act to make a supplemental appropriation to the Department of Transportation for railroad relocation demonstration projects, First Reading of the Bill. Committee Reports, Representative Matijevec, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 4, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendations. 'Do Pass', House Bill 1119. 'Do Pass as amended', House Bill 613, 1118 and 1418. Representative E. M. Barnes, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 4, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendations. 'Do Pass as amended', Senate Bill 485. No further business. The House now stands adjourned."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1.			
1	12:35	Speaker Redmond	House to order
1		Reverend Krueger	Prayer
1		Speaker Redmond	Roll Call
1		Waddell	Excused absences
1		Speaker Redmond	
2		Clerk O'Brien	
2		Speaker Redmond	Introduction former Member BB Wolf
2		Wolfe, B. B.	
2		Speaker Redmond	
2		Madigan	Excused absences
2		Speaker Redmond	
3		Bluthardt)	HB 427
)	
3		Speaker Redmond)	
3		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
3		Speaker Redmond)	
)	
4		Geo-Karis)	
4		Speaker Redmond	HB 75
4		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3
4	12:42	Houlihan)	
)	
5		Skinner)	
5		Speaker Redmond	
5		McMaster)	
)	
5		Skinner)	
5		Speaker Redmond	
5		Lucco	Announcement
5		Speaker Redmond	Amend adopted. HB 234 returned to 3rd Reading



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
6		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2 Amendment #3
6		Stearney	
6		Speaker Redmond	
6		Jaffe	
6		Speaker Redmond	
7		Houlihan, D. L.)	
7)	
7		Stearney)	
7		Speaker Redmond	
7		Jaffe	
7		Houlihan)	
7)	
7	12:47	Jaffe)	
8		Speaker Redmond	HB 614 returned to 2nd
8		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
8		Speaker Redmond	
8		Von Boeckman	
8		Speaker Redmond	Out of record. Return HB 507 to 2nd
8		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2
8		Speaker Redmond	
9		Bennett	
9		Speaker Redmond	
9	12:50	Beatty	
9		Speaker Redmond	
10		Bennett	
10		Speaker Redmond	
11		Tipsword)	
11)	
12		Beatty)	



3.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	12		Speaker Redmond	
	13	12:56	Houlihan, D. L.	To close
	13		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted-3rd Reading
	13		Clerk O'Brien	HB 614 - Amendment #1
	13		Speaker Redmond	
	13		Von Boeckman	
	13		Speaker Redmond	
	14		Houlihan, D. L.)	
	14		Von Boeckman)	
	14		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted-3rd Reading Return HB 297 to 2nd
	14		Von Boeckman)	Amendment #1
	14		Speaker Redmond)	
	14		Schneider	
	14		Speaker Redmond	
	14		Von Boeckman	Yield to Martin
	14		Speaker Redmond	
	15		Martin, L.	
	15		Speaker Redmond	
	15		Schneider)	
	15	1:05	Martin, L.)	
	15		Speaker Redmond)	Amendment adopted
	16		Levin)	Requests fiscal note
	16		Speaker Redmond	
	16		Martin, L.	
	16		Speaker Redmond	
	16		Schneider	



4.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	16		Speaker Redmond	
	16		Pullen	
	16		Speaker Redmond	
	16		Von Boeckman	
	16		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
	16		Schlickman	
	16		Schneider	Question
	17	1:10	Speaker Redmond	HB 297
	17		Clerk O'Brien	Fiscal note, etc
	17		Speaker Redmond	Third Reading. HB 334 to 2nd
	17		Beatty	
	17		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2
	17		Beatty	
	17		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted
	18		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3
	18		Speaker Redmond	
	18		Beatty	
	18		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted - 3rd Reading
	18		Robinson)	HB 1036 - Amendment #6
	19		Clerk O'Brien)	
	19		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted, returned PPC
	19		Von Boeckman	Introduction
	19		Speaker Redmond	
	19		Clerk O'Brien	HB 14 - 3rd Reading
	19	1:15	Yourell	
	19		Speaker Redmond	Passed
	19		Clerk O'Brien	HB 15 - 3rd Reading



5.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
21		Speaker Redmond	
21		Yourell	
21		Speaker Redmond	
22		Edgar	
22		Speaker Redmond	
22		Schneider	
22		Speaker Redmond	
22		Porter)	
23	1:20	Yourell)	
23		Speaker Redmond	
23		Hoffman)	
23		Yourell)	
23		Speaker Redmond	
24		Matijevich	
24		Speaker Redmond	
24		Yourell	To close
24	1:25	Speaker Redmond	Passed
24		Clerk O'Brien	HB 16 - 3rd Reading
24		Speaker Redmond	
25		Yourell	
25		Speaker Redmond	
26		Greiman	Speaks on Bill
26		Speaker Redmond	
27		Edgar	
27		Speaker Redmond	
28		Yourell	To close
28		Speaker Redmond	Passed



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

6.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
28		Lucco	Introduction
29		Speaker Redmond	#27-TOOR. 42-Mautino
29		Clerk O'Brien	Reads HB 42
29		Mautino	Explains 42 & Amendment #1
30		Speaker Redmond	Passed
31		Greiman	HB 65
31		Speaker Redmond	Recognize Davis
31		Davis	
31		Speaker Redmond	Recog Leinenweber
32		Leinenweber)	
)	
33		Greiman)	
33		Speaker Redmond	
33		Porter)	
)	
34		Greiman)	
34		Speaker Redmond	
35		Hudson)	
)	
36		Greiman)	
36		Greiman	HB 65
36	1:45	Hudson)	
)	
36		Greiman)	
36		Speaker Redmond	
36		Wikoff	
36		Speaker Redmond	
37	1:50	Mautino)	
)	
38		Greiman)	
38		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
7.			
38		Gaines)	
)	
38		Greiman)	
38		Speaker Redmond	
38		Ebbesen	MPQ
38		Speaker Redmond	
38	1:55	Greiman	To close
39		Speaker Redmond	
39		Cunningham	
39		Speaker Redmond	
40	1:56	Hoffman	Explains vote
40		Speaker Redmond	
40		Getty	Explains vote
40		Speaker Redmond	
40		Geo-Karis	
40		Speaker Redmond	Passed
41		Clerk O'Brien	HB 80 - 3rd Reading
41		Speaker Redmond	
41		Deuster	
41		Speaker Redmond	
41		McMaster)	
)	
42		Deuster)	
42		Speaker Redmond	
42		Leinenweber	
42		Speaker Redmond	
42		Waddell)	
)	
42		Deuster)	
42	2:01	Speaker Redmond	



<u>8.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	43		Friedland	Moves Previous Question
	43		Speaker Redmond	
	43		Deuster	
	43		Speaker Redmond	Lost
	44		Clerk O'Brien	HB 212 - 3rd Reading
	45		Totten	
	45		Speaker Redmond	
	45		Kosinski	
	45		Speaker Redmond	
	45		Byers	
	45	2:08	Speaker Redmond	Passed
	45		Clerk O'Brien	HB 227 - 3rd Reading
	45		Speaker Redmond	
	46		Miller	
	46		Speaker Redmond	
	46		Houlihan, D. L.	Urges 'no'
	47		Speaker Redmond	
	47	2:13	Conti	Vote 'no'
	48		Speaker Redmond	
	48		Giorgi)	
	48)	
	48		Miller)	
	48		Speaker Redmond	
	49		Jones, E.)	
	49)	
	49		Miller)	
	49		Speaker Redmond	
	50		Kosinski	
	50		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
9.			
50	2:20	Peters	Moves previous question
50		Speaker Redmond	
50		Miller	
50		Speaker Redmond	
51		Matijeovich	To close
51		Speaker Redmond	
52		Miller	To close
52		Speaker Redmond	
52	2:25	Taylor	
52		Speaker Redmond	
52		Taylor	Explains vote
52		Speaker Redmond	
52		Madison	Explains vote
52		Speaker Redmond	
53		Davis, C.	Explains vote
53		Speaker Redmond	Bill lost
53		Lucco	Introduction
53		Speaker Redmond	
53		Clerk O'Brien	HB 230 - 3rd Reading
53		Speaker Redmond	
53		Sevcik	
53		Speaker Redmond	Passed
54		Clerk O'Brien	HB 302 - 3rd Reading
55	2:30	Speaker Redmond	
55		Van Duyne	Sponsor
56		Speaker Redmond	



<u>10.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
56		Houlihan, Dan)	
)	
57		Van Duyne)	
57		Speaker Redmond	Passed
57		Clerk O'Brien	HB 314 - 3rd Reading
57		Speaker Redmond	
57		Stearney	
57		Speaker Redmond	
58		Lechowicz)	
)	
59		Stearney)	
59		Speaker Redmond	
60		Madison	
60		Speaker Redmond	
60	2:40	Giorgi	
61		Speaker Redmond	
61	2:42	Van Duyne	
61		Speaker Redmond	
61		McAuliffe	
62		Speaker Redmond	
62		Ewell	
62		Speaker Redmond	
63		Gaines	
63		Speaker Redmond	
64	2:45	Stearney	
64		Speaker Redmond	HB 314 - passed
64		Ebbesen	HB 318
65		Speaker Redmond	
65		Clerk Hall	Reads Bill



11.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	65		Speaker Redmond	
	65		Walsh	Against
	66		Speaker Redmond	
	66		Lauer	Against
	66		Speaker Redmond	
	67		McGrew	
	67		Speaker Redmond	
	67	2:55	Ebbesen	To close
	67		Speaker Redmond	Passed
	67		Clerk Hall	HB 322 - 3rd Reading
	68		Beatty	
	68		Speaker Redmond	
	68		Schlickman)	
	69		Beatty)	
	69		Speaker Redmond	
	69		Leinenweber	'No' vote
	69		Speaker Redmond	
	69		Schoberlein	
	69		Speaker Redmond	
	70		Waddell	Moves previous question
	70		Speaker Redmond	
	70	2:59	Beatty	To close
	70		Speaker Redmond	
	70	3:00	Speaker Redmond	HB 322 passed
	71		Davis, C.	Point personal privilege
	71		Speaker Redmond	
	71		Clerk Hall	HB 333 - 3rd Reading



12. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
71		Speaker Redmond	
72		Leinenweber	
73		Speaker Redmond	
74		Bradley	
75		Speaker Redmond	
75		Hudson	
75		Speaker Redmond	
76		Chapman)	
77		Leinenweber)	
77		Speaker Redmond	
77		Peters	Moves previous question
77		Speaker Redmond	
78		Leinenweber	To close
79	3:30	Barnes, G.	Explains 'no' vote
79		Speaker Redmond	
79		Gaines	Explains vote
79		Speaker Redmond	
80		Johnson	Support
80		Speaker Redmond	
81		Willer	Votes 'present'
81		Speaker Redmond	
81	3:37	Davis, C.	
81		Speaker Redmond	
82		Ryan	Introduction
82		Speaker Redmond	
82		Pullen	
82		Speaker Redmond	



13.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	82		Neff	Introduction
	83		Speaker Redmond	HB 333 passed
	83		Geo-Karis	Introduction & asks leave of House
	84		Speaker Redmond	
	84	3:30	Lucco	Introduction-Foreigners
	84		Speaker Redmond	
	84		Dunn, J.	Leave of House
	84		Speaker Redmond	
	84		Bluthardt	
	84		Clerk O'Brien	HB 338 - 3rd Reading
	84		Speaker Redmond	
	85		Davis, C.	
	85		Speaker Redmond	
	85		Giglio	
	85		Speaker Redmond	
	86	3:35	Beatty	
	86		Speaker Redmond	
	86		Bluthardt)	Personal privilege
	86		Speaker Redmond)	
	86		Davis, C.)	
	86		Telcser)	
	87		Speaker Redmond	
	87		Jones, J. D.	Leave vote 'aye' on 333
	87		Greiman	Leave 'no' on 212.
	87		Leverenz	'aye' on 333
	87	3:38	Speaker Redmond	HB 338 passed
	87		Clerk O'Brien	HB 341 - 3rd Reading



<u>14.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
87		Speaker Redmond	
87		Taylor	
87		Speaker Redmond	
88	3:40	Schlickman)	
)	
89		Taylor)	
89		Speaker Redmond	
89		Mugalian	
90		Speaker Redmond	Passed
90	3:45	Mann	Leave of House
90		Speaker Redmond	
90		Clerk Hall	HB 343 - 3rd Reading
90		Speaker Redmond	
90		Huff	
91		Speaker Bradley in the Chair - 343 passed	
91		Clerk Hall	HB 345 - 3rd Reading
91		Bradley	
91	3:48	McLendon	
91		Speaker Bradley	Passed
91		Clerk Hall	HB 358 - 3rd Reading
91		Speaker Bradley	
92		Pierce	
92		Speaker Bradley	
93		Polk)	
)	
93		Pierce)	
94		Speaker Bradley	
94	3:55	Bartulis	
94		Speaker Bradley	



15.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
94		Madison)	
)	
95		Pierce)	
95		Speaker Bradley	
95		Leverenz)	
)	
96		Pierce)	
96		Speaker Bradley	
97		Davis, J.)	
)	
97		Pierce)	
98		Speaker Bradley	
98		Brandt	Moves previous question
98		Speaker Bradley	
98	4:01	Pierce	To close
99		Speaker Bradley	
99		Neff	Objects
99	4:05	Speaker Bradley	HB 358 passed
99		Bartulis	Verification
99		Speaker Bradley	
100		Pierce	Poll absentees
100		Speaker Bradley	
100		Houlihan, J.	
100		Speaker Bradley)	
)	
100		Telcser)	
)	
100		Houlihan	
100		Speaker Bradley	
101		Flinn	Vote 'aye'
101		Speaker Bradley	
101		Clerk Hall	



16. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
101		Speaker Bradley	
101		Katz	Wants to be verified
101		Speaker Bradley	
101		Ryan	Change vote to 'aye'
101		Speaker Bradley	
101		Barnes, Jane	Votes 'no'
101		Speaker Bradley	
101		Clerk Hall	
101		Speaker Bradley	
101		Stearney	Change vote to 'no'
101		Speaker Bradley	
101		Stearney	'Yes'
101		Speaker Bradley	
101		Peters	
101		Speaker Bradley	
101		Clerk Hall	
102		Peters	Votes 'no'
102		Speaker Bradley	
102		Keats	
102		Speaker Bradley	
102		Clerk Hall	
102		Keats	Change vote to 'no'
102		Speaker Bradley	
102		Winchester	
102		Speaker Bradley	
102		Clerk Hall	
102		Winchester	Votes 'no'



17.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
102		Speaker Bradley	
102		Anderson	
102		Clerk Hall	
102		Anderson	Votes 'no'
102		Speaker Bradley	
102		Kempiners	
102		Speaker Bradley	
102		Kempiners	Votes 'present'
102		Speaker Bradley	
102		Edgar	Changes to 'no'
102		Speaker Bradley	
103		McCourt	
103		Speaker Bradley	
103		McCourt	Change to 'no'
103		Speaker Bradley	
103		Clerk Hall	
103		Brandt	Votes 'yes'
103		Speaker Bradley	
103		Clerk Hall	
103		Speaker Bradley	
103		Madison	Restates verification untimely
103		Speaker Bradley	Permission of Chief Sponsor
103		Madison	Not in Rules
103		Bradley	
103		Madison	
103		Speaker Bradley	
104		Bluthardt	'yes' to 'no'



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	104		Speaker Bradley	
	104		Madison	
	104		Speaker Bradley	
	104		Matijevecich	
	104		Speaker Bradley	
	104	4:15	Totten	
	104		Speaker Bradley	
	104		Pierce	
	104		Speaker Bradley	
	104		Bartulis)	
	104		Speaker Bradley)	
	104		Epton	Moves to reconsider
	105		Speaker Bradley	
	105		Bartulis	Withdraws request
	105		Speaker Bradley	HB 358 passed
	105		Madison	Moves motion lie on table
	105		Speaker Bradley	
	105	4:18	Epton	
	105		Speaker Bradley	
	105		Madison	Withdraws motion
	106		Speaker Bradley	
	106		Matijevecich	Moves Epton's motion lie on table
	106		Speaker Bradley	Matijevecich's motion fails
	106		Bartulis	
	106		Speaker Bradley	
	106		Clerk Hall	Polls absentees
	106		Mulcahey	Change to 'no'



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
19.			
107		Speaker Bradley	Motion fails
107		Clerk Hall	HB 364 - 3rd Reading
107		Totten	Leave to return to 2nd
107		Speaker Bradley	
107	4:25	Gaines	Leave of the House
108		Clerk Hall	HB 365 - 3rd Reading
108		Speaker Bradley	
108		Walsh	
108		Speaker Bradley	
108		Brady)	
)	
109		Walsh)	
109		Speaker Bradley	
109		Darrow)	
)	
110		Walsh)	
111		Speaker Bradley	
111		Matijeovich	
111		Walsh	
111		Speaker Bradley	
111		Leinenweber	
111		Speaker Bradley	
112		Willer)	
)	
112	4:35	Walsh)	
112		Speaker Bradley	
112		Yourell)	
)	
112		Walsh)	
112		Speaker Bradley	
113		Totten	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
20.			
113		Speaker Bradley	
113		Houlihan, J.)	
114		Walsh)	
114		Speaker Bradley	
114		Tuerk	Moves previous question
114		Speaker Bradley	
115		Walsh	To close
115		Speaker Bradley	
115		Matijeovich	Explains vote
115	4:40	Gaines	
116		Speaker Bradley	
116		Epton	Explains vote
116		Speaker Bradley	
116		Sandquist	Explains vote
116		Speaker Bradley	
116		Friedrich	Explains vote
117		Speaker Bradley	
117		Walsh	Explains vote
117		Speaker Bradley	HB 365 lost
117		Clerk O'Brien	HB-396--3rd-Reading
117		Speaker Bradley	
117		Terzich	
117		Speaker Bradley	
118		Clerk O'Brien	HB 379 - 3rd Reading
118		Speaker Bradley	
118		Terzich	Leave to return to 2nd
118		Speaker Bradley	



21.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	118		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2
	118		Speaker Bradley	
	118		Terzich	Leave to table Amendment #1
	118		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2
	118		Terzich	
	118		Speaker Bradley	
	118	4:44	Madison	
	118		Speaker Bradley	Amendment adopted-3rd Reading
	119		Clerk O'Brien	HB 396
	119		Speaker Bradley	
	119		Schuneman	
	119		Speaker Bradley	
	119		Friedland)	
	120)	
	120		Schuneman)	
	120		Speaker Bradley	
	120		Schuneman	To close
	120		Speaker Bradley	Passed
	121		Clerk O'Brien	HB 397
	121		Speaker Bradley	Vote Darrow 'aye' on 396
	121		Clerk O'Brien	HB 397
	121		Speaker Bradley	
	121		Catania	Explains 397
	121		Speaker Bradley	
	121		Getty	Support
	122		Speaker Bradley	
	122		Stearney	
	122		Speaker Bradley	



22.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	122		Stearney)	
)	
	123		Catania)	
)	
	123		Speaker Bradley	
	124		Schlickman	Solicits 'aye' votes
	125		Speaker Bradley	
	125		Catania	Close debate
	125		Speaker Bradley	
	125		Catania	Explains vote
	125		Speaker Bradley	
	126		Keats	
	126		Speaker Bradley	Passes
	126		Clerk O'Brien	HB 406
	126		Speaker Bradley	
	127		Stiehl	Explains
	127		Speaker Hart	Recognizes Bradley
	127		Bradley	
	127		Clerk O'Brien	
	128		Leinenweber	
	128		Speaker Bradley	
	128		Kelly	Questions
	128		Stiehl	Close
	128		Speaker Bradley	
	128		Collins	
	129		Speaker Bradley	
	128		Stiehl	
	129		Speaker Bradley	Passed
	129		Clerk O'Brien	HB 428



23.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	129		Speaker Bradley	
	129		Bluthardt	What happened to HB 427?
	129		Speaker Bradley	Taken back to 2nd
	129		Mugalian	Question HB 428
	129		Speaker Bradley	
	130		Bluthardt)	
)	
	130		Mugalian)	
	130		Speaker Bradley	
	130		Houlihan)	
)	
	130		Bluthardt)	
	131		Geo-Karis	Yield
	131		Bluthardt	
	131		Geo-Karis	
	131		Speaker Bradley	Passes HB 428 on to 444
	131	5:15	Clerk O'Brien	HB 444 - 3rd Reading
	131		Speaker Bradley	
	131		McLendon	
	132		Speaker Bradley	Passed
	132		Clerk O'Brien	HB 449 - 3rd Reading
	132		Speaker Bradley	
	132		Willer	
	133		Speaker Bradley	
	133		Conti	Oppose
	133		Speaker Bradley	
	134		Matijeovich)	
)	
	134		Willer)	
	134		Speaker Bradley	



<u>24.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
135		Bluthardt))	
135		Willer)	
136		Speaker Bradley	
136		Ebbesen	Moves previous question
136		Speaker Bradley	
136	5:27	Willer	To close
137		Speaker Bradley	
137		Mahar	Support
138		Speaker Bradley	
138		Dunn, J	Explains vote
138		Speaker Bradley	
139		Mugalian	
139		Speaker Bradley	
139		Willer	
139		Speaker Bradley	
140		Conti	
140		Speaker Bradley	
140		Taylor	
140		Speaker Bradley	
140		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
140		Shumpert	
140		Speaker Bradley)	
140)	
140		Clerk O'Brien)	
140		Shumpert	
140		Speaker Bradley	
140		Clerk O'Brien	
140		Farley	



25.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	140		Speaker Bradley	
	140	5:35	McLendon	
	140		Speaker Bradley	
	141		Conti	Requests verification
	141		Speaker Bradley	
	141		Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative Roll Call
	141		Speaker Bradley	
	141		Schlickman	
	142		Speaker Bradley)	
	142		Conti)	Questions Affirmative Roll
	142		Clerk O'Brien)	
	143		Hudson)	Vote me 'no'
	143		Speaker Bradley	
	143		Jones, E.	Vote 'aye'
	143		Speaker Bradley	
	143		Boucek	'aye'
	143		Conti	Proceeds
	143		Speaker Bradley	
	144		Leinenweber	'Present'
	144		Conti)	
	144		Speaker Bradley)	
	144		Porter	'Present'
	144		Speaker Bradley	
	144		Conti	
	144	5:47	Lechowicz	Change to 'aye'
	144		Conti	Continues
	144		Speaker Bradley	



26.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	145		Walsh	Change to 'no'
	145		Speaker Bradley	
	145		Dawson	Vote 'aye'
	145		Conti	Further questions
	145		Speaker Bradley	
	145		Johnson	Change to 'yes'
	145		Speaker Bradley	
	145		Terzich	'aye'
	145		Conti	Continues
	146		Speaker Bradley	
	146		Madison	Question
	146		Speaker Bradley	
	146		McCourt	Change to 'no'
	146	5:50	Speaker Bradley	HB 449 passed
	147		Tuerk	Leave of House
	147		Speaker Bradley	
	147		Clerk O'Brien	HB 464 - 3rd Reading
	147		Speaker Bradley	
	147		Von Boeckman	
	147		Speaker Bradley	
	147		Simms)	
	148		Von Boeckman)	
	149	6:57	Matijevec	
	140		Speaker Redmond	
	140	6:00	Johnson	
	150		Speaker Bradley	
	150		Bennett	



Page	Time	Speaker	Information
27.			
151		Speaker Bradley	
151		Von Boeckman	To close
151		Speaker Bradley	
151	6:05	Von Boeckman	
151		Speaker Bradley	
151		Cunningham	Change to 'aye'
152		Speaker Bradley	
152		Geo-Karis	Change to 'aye'
152		Speaker Bradley	
152		Peters	Votes 'no'
153		Speaker Bradley	
153		Mudd	Bad Bill
152		Speaker Bradley	
152		Von Boeckman	Postponed Consideration
152		Speaker Bradley	Placed on postponed consideration
152		Clerk Hall	HB 480
152		Speaker Bradley	
153		Deuster	Explains
153		Speaker Bradley	Recognize Kelly
154		Kelly	
154		Speaker Bradley	
154		Beatty	
154		Speaker Bradley	
155		Deuster)	
)	
156		Beatty)	
)	
157		Madison)	
)	
157		Deuster)	



28.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	158		Stuffle	
	158		Speaker Bradley	
	158		Deuster	To close
	158	6:21	Speaker Bradley	HB 480 passed
	158		Clerk Hall	HB 490 - 3rd Reading
	158		Speaker Bradley	
	158		Rigney	
	158		Speaker Bradley	
	159		Ebbesen	Question
	159		Rigney	
	159		Speaker Bradley	
	159		Wikoff	
	159		Speaker Bradley	
	159		Lucco	
	159		Speaker Bradley	
	160		Stuffle	
	160		Speaker Bradley	
	160		Adams	Moves previous question
	160		Speaker Bradley	
	160		Rigney	
	160		Speaker Bradley	
	160		Simms	'Yes'
	160		Speaker Bradley	Passes
	160		Clerk Hall	HB 493 - 3rd Reading
	161		Speaker Bradley	
	161		Antonovych	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

29.			
<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
161		Speaker Bradley	
162		Houlihan)	
162) Antonovych)	
162		Speaker Bradley	
163		Antonovych	To close
163		Speaker Bradley	Passed
163		Clerk O'Brien	HB 543 - 3rd Reading
163		Speaker Bradley	
164		Yourell	
164		Speaker Bradley	Passed
164		Madison	
164		Speaker Bradley)	
164	6:32) Clerk O'Brien)	HB 589. Third Reading
164		Hart	
165		Speaker Redmond in the Chair	
165		Houlihan, D. L.)	
166) Hart)	
166		Speaker Redmond	
166		Leinenweber	
166		Speaker Redmond	Passed
167		Yourell	
167		Speaker Redmond	
167		Ryan	
167		Speaker Redmond	
168	6:40	Hoffman, G.	
168		Speaker Redmond	
168		Matijevich	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
30.			
168		Lechowicz	Introduction Berman
168		Clerk O'Brien	HB 595 - 3rd Reading
168		Speaker Redmond	
169	6:42	Sandquist	
169		Speaker Redmond	
169		Madison)	
)	
169		Sandquist)	
169		Speaker Redmond	Passed
170		Clerk O'Brien	HB 624 - 3rd Reading
170		Speaker Redmond	
170	6:45	Byers	
170		Speaker Redmond	Passed
170		Clerk O'Brien	HB 625 - 3rd Reading
170		Speaker Redmond	
170		Byers	
170		Speaker Redmond	
171		Pullen	Question
171		Byers	
171		Clerk O'Brien	HB 627 - 3rd Reading
171		Speaker Redmond	
171		Byers	
171		Speaker Redmond	
171	6:48	Totten	
171		Speaker Redmond	
172		McClain)	
)	
172		Byers)	
172		Speaker Redmond	



31. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
173		Kempiners)	
173		Byers)	
173		Speaker Redmond	
174		Dunn, J.)	
174		Byers)	
174		Speaker Redmond	
174		Matijevich	
174		Speaker Redmond	
174		Schuneman)	
175		Byers)	
175		Speaker Redmond	
176	6:55	Geo-Karis	Supports
176		Speaker Redmond	
176		Collins	
176		Speaker Redmond	
176		Getty	Moves previous question
176		Speaker Redmond	
177		Byers	To close
177		Speaker Redmond	HB 627 passed
177		Epton	
177		Clerk O'Brien	HB 646 - 3rd Reading
177		Speaker Redmond	
177		Kempiners	Leave to return to 2nd
178		Speaker Redmond	
178		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2
178		Kempiners	
178		Speaker Redmond	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

32. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
178		Houlihan, D. L.)	
178	7:00	Kempiners)	
178		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted - 3rd Reading
179		Dunn, R.	Leave to return HB 641 to 2nd
179		Speaker Redmond	
179		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
179		Speaker Redmond	
179		Dunn, R.	
179		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted - 3rd Reading
179		Clerk O'Brien	HB 647 - 3rd Reading
179		Speaker Redmond	
180		Kempiners	
180		Speaker Redmond	
180		Houlihan, D. L.)	
180		Kempiners)	
180		Speaker Redmond	
180		Lucco	
180		Speaker Redmond	HB 647 passed
180	7:05	Clerk O'Brien	HB 669 - 3rd Reading
181		Terzich	
181		Speaker Redmond	Passed
181		Clerk O'Brien	HB 675 - 3rd Reading
181		Speaker Redmond	
181		Steele, E. G.	
181		Speaker Redmond	Passed
181		Clerk O'Brien	HB 677 - 3rd Reading
181		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
33.			
182		Skinner	
182		Speaker Redmond	
183		McClain)	
183		Skinner)	
183		Speaker Redmond	
184		Satterthwaite	Speaks to Bill
184		Speaker Redmond	
184	7:11	Pierce	
184		Speaker Redmond	
185		Hanahan	
185		Speaker Redmond	
185		Waddell	Support
185		Speaker Redmond	
185	7:15	McGrew	Moves previous question
185		Skinner	To close
185		Speaker Redmond	HB 677 passed
186		Clerk O'Brien	HB 684 - 3rd Reading
186		Speaker Redmond	
186		Satterthwaite	
186		Speaker Redmond	
186		Martin, L.)	
186		Satterthwaite)	
187		Speaker Redmond	
187	7:18	Peters	
187		Speaker Redmond	
187		McGrew	
188		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
34.			
188		Hoffman, G.	
188		Speaker Redmond	
188		Wolf	
188		Speaker Redmond	
188		Satterthwaite	
188		Speaker Redmond	Dump Roll
189		Ryan	Verification
189		Speaker Redmond	Dump Roll
189		Brady	Explains vote
189		Speaker Redmond	
189	7:23	Stuffle	
189		Speaker Redmond	
190		Satterthwaite	Poll absentees
190	7:25	Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
190		Speaker Redmond	
190		Satterthwaite	
190		Speaker Redmond	
190		Ryan	Verify
190		Speaker Redmond	
190		Clerk O'Brien	Proceeds with absentees
190		Speaker Redmond	
190		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
190		Speaker Redmond	
191		Johnson	Change to 'present'
191		Speaker Redmond	
191		Ryan)	Count?
191		Clerk O'Brien)	



35. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
191		Speaker Redmond	
191		Clerk O'Brien	Proceeds Affirmative Roll Call
191	7:27	McAvoy	Change to 'no'
191		Speaker Redmond	
191		Wall	Change to 'no'
191		Speaker Redmond	
191		Houlihan, D.	May I be verified?
191		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
192		Speaker Redmond)	
)	
192		Stanley)	Change to 'present'
192		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
193		Speaker Redmond	
193		Ryan	Count
193		Clerk O'Brien)	89 'aye's - 55 'nays'
)	
193		Ryan)	Questions Affirmative Roll
)	
193		Speaker Redmond)	
194		Satterthwaite	Postponed Consideration
194		Speaker Redmond	
194		Clerk O'Brien	HB 691 - 3rd Reading
194		Speaker Redmond	
194	7:38	McGrew	
194		Speaker Redmond	
194		McCourt	
194		Speaker Redmond	
194		McGrew)	Point of order
)	
195		McCourt)	Responds
195		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
36.			
196		Schneider	
196		Speaker Redmond	
196		Keats)	
)	
196		McGrew)	
197		Speaker Redmond	
197		Stuffle	Urge 'yes' vote
197		Speaker Redmond	
197		Totten	Move previous question
197		Speaker Redmond	
197	7:45	McGrew	To close
197		Speaker Redmond	
198		Lauer	Explains vote
198		Speaker Redmond	HB 691 passed
198		Clerk O'Brien	HB 702 - Third Reading
198		Speaker Redmond	
198		Flinn	
198		Speaker Redmond	
199		Houlihan, D.)	
)	
199		Flinn)	
)	
199		Speaker Redmond)	
199		Martin, L.	Explains vote
200		Speaker Redmond	
200		McMaster	Support
200		Speaker Redmond	
200		Totten	Opposes
200		Speaker Redmond	
200		Yourell	Support



<u>37.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	200		Speaker Redmond	
	201		Hudson	'No'
	201		Flinn	
	201		Speaker Redmond	
	202		Hoffman	
	202		Speaker Redmond	
	202		Keats	
	202		Speaker Redmond	
	202	8:55	Flinn	Postponed Consideration
	202		Speaker Redmond	
	202		Matijevich	
	202		Speaker Redmond	
	203		Ryan	
	203		Speaker Redmond	
	203		Leinenweber	
	203		Speaker Redmond	
	204		McGrew	
	204		Speaker Redmond	Motion to adjourn carries
	204		Clerk O'Brien	
	204		Speaker Redmond	Perfunct for 3 minutes
	204		Houlihan, J.	
	204		Speaker Redmond	
	205	8:00	Clerk O'Brien	First Readings. Committee Reports. Adjourned.

